SPARSA COLLECTA

PART THREE

SUPPLEMENTS TO

NOVUM TESTAMENTUM

EDITORIAL STAFF

C. K. BARRETT, Durham
A. F. J. KLIJN, Groningen—J. SMIT SIBINGA, Amsterdam

Editorial Secretary: H. J. DE JONGE, Leiden

VOLUME XXXI

LEIDEN / E. J. BRILL / 1983

SPARSA COLLECTA

THE COLLECTED ESSAYS OF
W. C. VAN UNNIK

PART THREE
PATRISTICA • GNOSTICA • LITURGICA

LEIDEN / E. J. BRILL / 1983

Published with financial support from the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research (Z.W.O.)

ISBN 90 04 06260 2
90 04 06262 9

Copyright 1983 by E. J. Brill, Leiden, The Netherlands

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced or translated in any form, by print, photoprint, microfilm, microfiche or any other means without written permission from the publisher

PRINTED IN THE NETHERLANDS BY E. J. BRILL

CONTENTS

Preface IX

PATRISTICA

A Note on Ode of Solomon xxxiv 4 3
(*The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXVII, 1936)
The Significance of Moses' Law for the Church of Christ according to the Syriac Didascalia 7
(*Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* XXXI, 1940)
Notes on the Nature of Clemens Alexandrinus' *Canon Ecclesiasticus* 40
(*Nederlands Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* XXXIII, 1942)
Is 1 Clement 20 purely Stoic? 52
(*Vigiliae Christianae* IV, 1950)
The Character of Early Christian Apologetics in the Pseudo-Justinian *Oratio ad Graecos* 59
(*Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* VII, 1952-53)
Zur Bedeutung von ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΥΝ ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧΗΝ bei den Apostolischen Vätern 71
(*Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 44, 1953)
Christianity and Nationalism in the First Centuries of the History of the Church (*Christendom en Nationalisme. Lustrumbundel Christelijke Historici*, 's-Gravenhage 1956) 77
"Diaspora" and "Church" in the First Centuries of Christian History 95
(*Ekklesia. Feestbundel voor J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink*, 's-Gravenhage 1959)
Die Gotteslehre bei Aristides und in gnostischen Schriften 106
(*Theologische Zeitschrift* XVII, 1961)
Der Ausdruck „in den letzten Zeiten" bei Irenaeus 114
(*Neotestamentica et Patristica. Festschrift für Prof. Dr. Oscar Cullmann*, Leiden 1962)
Le nombre des élus dans la première épître de Clément 124
(*Revue d'Histoire et de Philosophie religieuses* XLII, 1962)
ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ in the *Catechetical Homilies* of Theodore of Mopsuestia . 134
(*Mélanges offerts à Mlle Christine Mohrmann*, Utrecht-Antwerpen 1963)
A Note on the Dance of Jesus in the *Acts of John* 144
(*Vigiliae Christianae* XVIII, 1964)

An Unusual Formulation of the Redemption in the Homily on the Passion by Melito of Sardis 148
(*Ex auditu verbi. Jubilee volume presented to Prof. Dr. G. C. Berkouwer*, Kampen 1965)

GNOSTICA

The Recently Discovered *Gospel of Truth* and the New Testament ... 163
(H. C. Puech-G. Quispel-W. C. van Unnik, *The Jung Codex*, London 1955)
The Origin of the Recently Discovered *Apocryphon Jacobi* 192
(*Vigiliae Christianae* X, 1956)
Die jüdische Komponente in der Entstehung der Gnosis 199
(*Vigiliae Christianae* XV, 1961)
Die ,,Zahl der Vollkommenen Seelen'' in der *Pistis Sophia* 214
(*Abraham Unser Vater. Festschrift für Otto Michel*, Leiden 1963)
The Relevance of the Study of Gnosticism 224
(*Address, February 27, 1964*, Union Theological Seminary, Virginia)
Three Notes on the *Gospel of Philip* 238
(*New Testament Studies* 10, 1964)
The Newly Discovered Gnostic *Epistle to Rheginos* on the Resurrection 244
(*The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* XV, 1964)
Die ,,geöffneten Himmel'' in der Offenbarungsvision des Apokryphons des Johannes 273
(*Apophoreta. Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen*, Berlin 1964)
Les idées des Gnostiques concernant l'Église 285
(*Aux Origines de l'Église. Recherches Bibliques VII*, Bruges 1965)

LITURGICA

Les cheveux défaits des femmes baptisées. Un Rite de Baptême dans l'ordre ecclésiastique d'Hippolyte 299
(*Vigiliae Christianae* I, 1947)
Notes on a New Interpretation of the Anamnesis Words 318
(*Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* IV, 1950)
1 Clement 34 and the ''Sanctus'' 326
(*Vigiliae Christianae* V, 1951)
Dominus Vobiscum: the Background of a Liturgical Formula 362
(*New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson*, Manchester 1959)

INDEXES TO *SPARSA COLLECTA* I-III

Preface to the indexes 394
Index of passages 395
Index of modern authors 414
Index of subjects 418

PREFACE

This is the third volume of the collected essays of W. C. van Unnik. It concludes the series as the author projected it as long ago as 1970. The volume contains his work in the fields of Patristics, Gnosticism and Liturgy and shows the breadth of his scholarship in these fields. In the last decade of his life Van Unnik devoted much of his research to these same fields and it is to be hoped that the fruits of that research, mostly published in his own language, can be translated and published within the next few years.

The editors were fortunate that Mr. L. W. Nijendijk, theol. drs., joined the New Testament department at the university of Utrecht as a research assistant in 1981 and was willing to take a great share in the editorial work for this volume. It is fitting that his name appears underneath this preface.

This volume contains the indexes to the three volumes. They were prepared by Mr. L. van Kampen, theol. drs., to whom the editors express their indebtedness and gratitude. The indexes will make the treasures of scholarship contained in the more than thousand pages of Sparsa Collecta more accessible.

The editors wish to thank the Board of the Netherlands Organization for the Advancement of Pure Research Z.W.O. for the financial support which made possible the publication of this volume. They are also indebted to the publishers, E. J. Brill of Leiden, for their continuing efforts in the preparation and publication. The editors regret that it was not possible to print the notes at the bottom of the pages. They have been printed at the end of each article.

Utrecht, Summer 1983

J. Reiling
G. Mussies
P. W. van der Horst
L. W. Nijendijk

PATRISTICA

A NOTE ON ODE OF SOLOMON xxxiv 4*

THE short 34th Ode of Solomon teaches that life is easy for the simple-hearted, for they know that everything below is nothing but make-belief. Reality is on high.

4: ܗܘ ܕܠܥܠ ܗܘ ܕܬܚܬ ܐܝܟ ܕܡܬ ܗܘ ܕܠܥܠ

'The likeness of that which is below, is that which is above', says the translation of Drs Harris and Mingana[1]; instead of 'likeness' we should rather say 'the pattern', as this brings out better the sort of Platonic 'idea' the author seems to have in mind.

In their commentary the learned editors remark that this little Ode is quite unlike the rest of the collection, 'and does not proceed from any scriptural base' (II, p. 379). There is one remarkable thing about it, viz. that it seems to be quoted in the ninth century by the Syriac father Moses bar Kepha in his *Exposition of the Jacobite Liturgy*. This text was first published in 1913 by the well-known Syriac scholar Dom Connolly; he, too, was the first to draw attention to the parallel[2]. The place in view reads as follows: '*Concerning the deacons.*—The rank of the deacons is the order of the angels; for they perform the service of the cherubim, and of the seraphim which with their wings cover the altar: not that they may drive away flies[3], but that they may not suffer anything to approach it which is not permitted to do so. For it is said (lit. they say): ''The likeness of what is above are the things which are below'' (ܕܡܬ ܗܘ ܕܠܥܠ ܐܝܟ ܕܬܚܬ ܗܘ ܕܠܥܠ, pp. 35-36, Syriac text, p. ط). Moses seems to be following here a tradition of his own, for his predecessor George, bishop of the Arabs, whose explanation was published together with that of Moses, has the same remark about the heavenly example of the deacons (which is a thought occurring in almost every Eastern Mystagogy), but without the quotation. From what source is it derived? In answer to this question it was suggested with some hesitation by Dom Connolly that Moses had in mind this very same verse by the author of the Ode. The editors of the Odes were not troubled by any such hesitation, and decided: 'It is almost certain that Bar Kepha is acquainted with the Odes in this passage and elsewhere' (l.c., II, p. 29).

But if we look more closely into the matter we find some grave objections against this statement. In itself it is not surprising that the Odes should have been read by this writer in the ninth century, as we know from the evidence of the MSS that they were read and copied in Syriac monasteries even at a later date (the date of the MSS is not made certain

by colophon, but one is assigned to the tenth century or even later, the other to the sixteenth, according to the description in Harris and Mingana, l.c., I, pp. ix-x). But in the first place, we are not told expressly what passages in the Odes are meant by 'elsewhere'. In all probability this reference is to an article by Mr R. A. Aytoun, *The Mysteries of Baptism by Moses bar Cepha compared with the Odes of Solomon*[4]. This writer adduces a number of parallels between this treatise of Moses, a translation of which is given, and passages from the Odes. None of these, however, is sufficient to prove beyond doubt the dependence of Moses on the Odes. Moses bar Kepha is working upon older Syriac rituals and other materials. The purpose Mr Aytoun had in mind was to confirm from this source the thesis of Dr Bernard (that the Odes are all Baptismal Hymns); in this he has perhaps succeeded. But this agreement between Moses and the Odes is entirely dependent upon the intermediary of the Baptismal theology of the third and fourth centuries. From this article alone it cannot be argued that the Odes were known to Moses. Secondly, the quotation is not literal; as a matter of fact, we have in both places a reversed order of thoughts. The points from which the writers look are opposed to one another! In the third place, we may ask: even if it were granted that the Odes were known to Moses and that he is quoting them here, what could have suggested to him to take this place as a scriptural proof-text (as these are generally introduced by: 'they say')? In this case we must make a further assumption, viz. that the Odes were regarded by Moses as sacred Scripture. I myself fail to see any parallel between the passage of the Odes and that of Moses.

As I have pointed out (above, n. 3), the writer of the *Exposition* is setting himself in opposition to a thought expressed in the *Apostolic Constitutions*. Even a superficial comparison of this explanation with those contained in other books of the same type (Mystagogies) shows clearly that Moses stands amidst a living tradition. We ask, is there any liturgical passage or any explanation of the liturgy which may have been known to Moses and which expresses the same thought? The answer is in the affirmative. If we turn to the Mystagogy incorporated in the *Testamentum Domini* we read in ch. 28: هذا هو المسيح الذي صلب فجعل الأشياء التي عن اليمين مثل التي عن اليسار والتي في الأعالي مثل التي في الأسافل والتي من خلف مثل التي من قدام لما قام من الأموات ووطئ الجحيم وأبطل الموت. ...

'He being the Christ who was crucified, by whom the things that were on the left hand were placed on the right hand, and *those which were beneath as those which were above*, and those which were behind as those which were before, when He rose from the dead, and trod down Sheol, and by death slew Death, &c.' (tr. Cooper and Maclean; italics are mine). I am fully

aware that here again the quotation is not literal, but it is very important to notice that the point of view here is exactly the same as in Moses. The context here is, of course, quite different from that of Moses, but Moses, like all Eastern fathers, was not a man of modern exegetical methods. In any case it is liturgical, and I believe that I am not mistaken in saying that the thought expressed in the *Test. Domini* is the living and organizing force of the Eastern idea of the Liturgy. I do not think that Moses is directly dependent upon the *Test.*, but that he had in mind some sort of text like this. (We must always remember that by far the largest part of instruction and tradition was, unfortunately for us, oral.)

But we can go further. For the text from the *Test. Domini*, just quoted, finds a striking parallel in the *Acts of Peter* 38 (Mart. Petri 9). Peter is crucified and then expounds the Mystery of the Cross. He says that by his sin the first man has made everything the opposite to what it ought to be; then he goes on: περὶ ὧν ὁ Κύριος ἐν μυστηρίῳ λέγει: ἐὰν μὴ ποιήσητε τὰ δεξιὰ ὡς τὰ ἀριστερὰ καὶ τὰ ἀριστερὰ ὡς τὰ δεξιὰ καὶ τὰ ἄνω ὡς τὰ κάτω καὶ τὰ ὀπίσω ὡς τὰ ἔμπροσθεν, οὐ μὴ ἐπιγνῶτε τὴν βασιλείαν.[6] We see that this is the same thought put into the mouth of the Lord, while in the *Test.* it is expanded and is looked upon as brought about by Christ Himself, for which we may be thankful. It is not clear what is meant by 'in a Mystery'. Is it something like the explanations in the *Epistula Apostolorum*, or in *Pistis Sophia*? Or does it simply mean 'symbolically'?[7] It has been suggested by Dr Hennecke[8] that this is a quotation from the *Gospel of the Egyptians*. This point is difficult to decide since we do not know precisely what was contained in this apocryphal Gospel. But in any case it may really be an old-Christian agraphon, upon which both the author of the Ode and the writer of the *Acts of Peter* and the *Test. Domini* have built; that the wording in these books is not the same is not surprising as the agrapha circulated in various slightly different forms, and translation has also to be taken into account.

If this is true, we have found for the Ode a kind of Scripture text which is treated in the same way as, according to the learned editors of the Odes, many other passages from Holy Writ. However this may be, the parallelism seemed to me remarkable enough to deserve attention.

NOTES

* Appeared in: *The Journal of Theological Studies* XXXVII (1936), p. 172-175.

[1] J. Rendel Harris and A. Mingana, *The Odes and Psalms of Solomon*, Manchester 1916-1920, 2 vols.

[2] R. H. Connolly and H. W. Codrington, *Two Commentaries on the Jacobite Liturgy*, London 1913 (Text and Translation Society). Cf. l.c. p. 35, n. 4; and see Harris and Mingana, l.c. ii p. 29.

[3] In the *Constitutiones Apostolicae* viii 12 the writer mentions this expressly as the task of the deacons with their fans. It is remarkable to see that Moses clearly opposes this ordering of the task.

[4] In *The Expositor*, viii 10 (1911) pp. 338-358.

[5] I. E. Rahmani, *Testamentum Domini Nostri Jesu Christi*, Mainz 1899, p. 64.

[6] R. A. Lipsius and M. Bonnet, *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*, Leipzig, i p. 94. G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, Göttingen 1921, I p. 128, n. 1 has drawn attention to another parallel between the sequence of this passage in the *Acta Petri* and the Mystagogy of the *Test. Domini*.

[7] Cf. E. Hatch, *Essays in Biblical Greek*, Oxford 1889, s.v.

[8] E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*[2], Tübingen 1924, p. 59 (he does not give reasons for his suggestion).

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF MOSES' LAW FOR THE CHURCH OF CHRIST ACCORDING TO THE SYRIAC DIDASCALIA[1]

One of the key questions regularly tackled by early Christian writers because of its fundamental importance for the teaching and the life of the church is the famous 'Cur Deus homo?'—'Why did God become man?'—Why did Jesus Christ become incarnate? Answers given in the New Testament such as Paul's solemn assurance: "Here are words you may trust, words that merit full acceptance: 'Christ Jesus came into the world to save sinners' " (1 Timothy 1:15)[2] and John's statement: "The Son of God appeared for the very purpose of undoing the devil's work" (1 John 3:8) required further explanation or had to be defended in controversy. This development is already evident in the writings of the so-called Apostolic Fathers: a characteristic example is to be found in the Epistle of "Barnabas" (5:6-7)

> αὐτὸς δὲ ἵνα καταργήσῃ τὸν θάνατον καὶ τὴν ἐκ νεκρῶν ἀνάστασιν δείξῃ, ὅτι ἐν σαρκὶ ἔδει αὐτὸν φανερωθῆναι, ὑπέμεινεν, ἵνα καὶ τοῖς πατράσιν τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν ἀποδῷ καὶ αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ τὸν λαὸν τὸν καινὸν ἑτοιμάζων ἐπιδείξῃ[3].

A close connection is constantly being forged between the Incarnation and salvation. The intrinsic unity of these two is strongly and steadily reaffirmed by Irenaeus in the face of Gnostic attacks[4]. The famous saying of Athanasius "Αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐνηνθρώπησεν, ἵνα ἡμεῖς θεοποιηθῶμεν"[5] might well be regarded as the *leitmotiv* in the thought of Eastern Christendom on this issue: time and again through the centuries we hear it reiterated in some form or other[6].

It is not my intention in this article to enter more fully into a discussion about the way in which this answer was formulated, nor do I intend to cover the fierce controversy fought over this formula, which was of such importance for church and state, or to demonstrate how the attempt was made, to order the church so as to comply with the commands of Him, who came to break the powers of the demons and to gather for Himself a "new nation"[7], and how the meaning of the Sacraments was interpreted from this perspective. I only mention the various lines of thought along which this central motif was developed in order to show how wide a range of ideas are found within this development and how a different answer given to the question might lead to radically different perspectives.

For, while the Athanasian formula can well be said to be the classic answer and to have been dominant in the East, that does not mean that there are no others. One such alternative is to be found in the so-called

Syriac Didascalia: "For our Saviour came for no other cause but to fulfil the law, and to set us loose from the bonds of the Second Legislation"[8]. In some ways this word is not so strange: we clearly hear an echo of the famous saying from the Sermon on the Mount: "Do not suppose that I have come to abolish the Law and the prophets; I did not come to abolish, but to complete". (Mt. 5:17). But what are we to make of the words that follow: "and to set us loose from the bonds of the Second Legislation"? Clearly we are not dealing with an incidental aside but with a theme of considerable importance in the thought-world of the author of the Didascalia. Elsewhere, for example, he writes: "For in the Gospel He renewed and fulfilled and affirmed the Law; but the Second Legislation He did away and abolished. For indeed it was to this end that He came, that He might affirm the Law, and abolish the Second Legislation, and fulfil the power of men's liberty, and show forth the resurrection of the dead"[9]. Here the closing words are reminiscent of Barnabas (see above)[10]. Similar expressions are to be found in other places, which we will have cause to refer to in the course of this article, and at the end of his work the author devotes a lengthy chapter to an exposition of his opinion on this point. A closer study of this interpretation of Christ's coming will prove well worth the effort. The question we pose is this: *What, according to the Syriac Didascalia, is the relationship of Christ to the Old Testament Law*? or we could put it differently: *What, according to this work, is the significance of the Mosaic Law for the Church of Christ*? Before we discuss these questions, we need first to make some remarks about the transmission and about the nature of the Didascalia.

The name given to this document is rather misleading, as it suggests that it might have originated in the Syrian Church (in the area of Edessa or Mesopotamia in Jacobite or Nestorian churches). This is in fact not the case. The name springs from the fact that this work first came to light in a Syriac translation.

In 1854 Paul Bötticher, later better known as de Lagarde, published a Syriac text from a Monophysite manuscript in the *Bibliothèque Nationale* in Paris, which contained a sizeable collection of canonical literature (no. 62; previously Sangerm. 38)[11]. He named it: "Didascalia Apostolorum Syriace"[12]. It was not accompanied by a translation, but he did in the same year publish a reconstruction of the Greek text of which the Syriac was a translation. This reconstruction proved possible because it was discovered that there was a close connection between the Didascalia and the first six books of the so-called Apostolic Constitutions. Later other Syriac manuscripts were discovered, containing our document. Meanwhile E. Hauler brought to light a large number of fragments of a Latin translation from a famous palimpsest at Verona[13]. Among translations

that by J. Flemming, greatly enriched by some excellent studies by H. Achelis, is justly acclaimed[14].

A quarter of a century later a new English translation appeared in print with, for added advantage, the Latin fragments printed opposite as they occur. This was the work of Dom. R. H. Connolly, already well known as a translator of Syriac liturgical texts with an expert knowledge of the oldest documents on ecclesiastical law. This latest edition may well be rated as the best available, not only on the strength of the translation itself but also because of its informative introduction and illuminating notes[15].

The Didascalia has been preserved in two translations, one in Latin, the other in Syriac. Only the latter is complete; it is divided into 26 chapters, the divisions not always most appropriately placed. Both translations were, according to the experts, made in the 4th century. The original Greek text has been lost but an edited version appears in the Apostolic Constitutions. This new 'edition' was probably the reason for the loss of the original. As the relationship between these two writings has implications for our present study we shall need to give some attention to this question.

The eight books of the *Apostolic Constitutions*, which originated in the area of Antioch around A.D. 450, have been known in Greek since A.D. 1594, and it had for long been suspected that they were a compilation of earlier sources on ecclesiastical law[16]. This suspicion was amply justified when not only the Didascalia but also the Didache and other documents about early Christian church order (*inter alia* the so-called Canons of Hippolytus) came to light. A careful comparison shows that the author of the Apostolic Constitutions dealt with the Didascalia in a fairly arbitrary way rearranging a large number of passages, expanding several others, sometimes interlacing Biblical proof-texts and leaving out unacceptable material, all this particularly noticeable in his handling of Didascalia 26, the chapter that is of particular interest for this study. It could be said that the Didascalia has been brought "up to date" in chapters I-VI of the Apostolic Constitutions.

Arabic and Ethiopic manuscripts are also extant bearing the title "Didascalia" which in one way or another preserve our work in extended form[17]. The exact relationship between the *Didasc. Syr.*, *Didasc. Arab.* (resp. *Eth.*) and the *Apost. Constitutions* is a matter that cannot be determined, as not all the relevant texts have as yet been published and careful research in this area has therefore not yet taken place. What is clear is that the Syriac Didascalia is the document on which other translations are ultimately based. Whether, however, the next stage was a Greek text (subsequently translated into Arabic and Ethiopic) which with

some additions appeared in the Apostolic Constitutions, or whether the sequence ran otherwise is not so clear. On the whole the trend is to favour the former possibility; see e.g. F. Nau, the well-known French Orientalist[18], and J. M. Harden[19]. The main argument is that the Arabic (Ethiopic) versions contain material from *Ap. Const.* I-VII (I-VI) but not from the important Book VIII. It seems to me, however, that a comparison of the sentence-structures and choice of words of the basic text and its dependants points in a different direction. Fresh research is needed, which will take into account other early Christian literature on church order which is extant in Arabic and Ethiopic[20].

This work purports to be the teaching delivered by the twelve Apostles during their deliberations at the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15) to further the instruction of the churches (see Acts 24-25). However, this is obviously fiction, as the Jews are evidently no longer in a position to observe the ceremonial laws due to the destruction of the altar and the Temple[21]. Thus the author gives himself away, and there is no need to make the further point that the Church would never have allowed a genuinely apostolic document to disappear from currency. Nevertheless, the indications the author gives are not many and he maintains his fiction with some skill: Paul is, for instance, never quoted. I doubt, however, that Burkitt is right in arguing[22] that this has given our work a somewhat antiquarian flavour, to which he also attributes its interest in the Law. To my mind he has failed to provide any proof to support this theory. Other documents have been published under the name of the Apostles, but it is difficult to maintain that these tend to distort the situations to which they are actually addressed (at least as far as we are able to check facts). *From our point of view*, of course, some of the allusions will apppear to be rather vague. What we may legitimately deduce from the maintenance of this fiction is that the choice of issues discussed here was not made arbitrarily. It is maintained that the Apostles came together for the specific purpose of taking action against specific errors. The task completed, they departed. *There was therefore a very real and specific need to which the Didascalia was addressed.*

This first impression is reinforced by the recognition that the Didascalia makes no attempt to provide a systematic view of Christian life and of church order in all its variety. There is, for instance, only one reference to such an indubitably important matter as the Eucharist and that only in passing[23]: clearly the Lord's Supper and its celebration are presupposed to be matters of commonplace. A survey of the contents[24], which takes note both of those issues which are covered and of those which are not touched upon, forces us to the conclusion that we have before us a treatise written to meet specific needs rather than an all-

embracing work on church order in primitive form. The kind of issues dealt with here appear to be controversies which also feature in other third century writers, e.g. penitential discipline, Paschal fasts; readers are warned against dangers which needed particular attention in that period such as attitudes towards pagan culture or lawsuits between Christians. These instructions are delivered in high-flown language with much repetition and liberally interlaced with Biblical quotations both from the Old and the New Testaments. The style is reminiscent of a rather fulsome preacher's utterances rather than of a jurist's sharply defined verdicts. The character of this treatise is, therefore, wholly different from that of the "Apostolic Canons" preserved for us in so many ways and from that of the later decisions taken by synods or experts in canonical law. Another notable difference is that between the Didascalia and the better-known Didache. There are for example no formulae to be found here. The author (for convenience I am assuming that this work comes from the pen of one writer, though I am well aware of the impossibility of deciding whether we are dealing with one or more authors) speaks out against worldliness, encouraging a pure Christian community life, but he also sets himself against a "Super-Christianity" rooted in judaizing tendencies.

Normally the Didascalia is thought to date from the third century[25]. There can be no objections to this. On the contrary, the attitude displayed towards Rome[26] only fits the period prior to Constantine. However, no purchase can be found to gain a more precise grip on the date. Usually the place of origin is assumed to be the plains of Northern Palestine or Coelesyria. This theory was advocated by Achelis on the grounds that he detected a strong Jewish-Christian influence in the circles from which this work emanated. Connolly rejected the reasoning but came to the same conclusion on other grounds. As a matter of fact a variety of data point in this direction[27].

We will now have to leave these introductory questions as well as the many other fascinating issues raised by the Didascalia such as the use of apocryphal biblical quotations. Those wishing to pursue these are referred to the literature already cited. We must now address ourselves to the main purpose of this enquiry.

We have already noted that the author devotes an entire chapter (26) to an extensive development of his ideas concerning the relationship between Christ and the Law of Moses. An analysis of this chapter[28] will provide us with the best introduction to a discussion of our theme and will at the same time give us a useful grasp of the method of argument employed. Other comments which need to be made en passant will slot into this approach quite naturally.

The message is addressed to those from among the People who have been converted to faith in God, our Saviour Jesus Christ[29]. They are admonished not to persist in their former ways by the observance of vain obligations, purifications, sprinklings and baptisms[30] and distinction of meats. Here the word of the Lord is valid, which bids us not to remember the former things, because God is making a way in the deserts. For formerly the churches were indeed deserts, but now there is a highway, even Jesus Christ and his whole οἰκονομία (= household; the customary word for God's saving dispensation), which was from the beginning. The Law He gave was simple, pure and holy[31], wherein our Saviour set His Name. For He gave the Ten Commandments and thereby made known the Name of Jesus, because "Ten" = "Yod" and "Yod" is the beginning of the name of Jesus. Here we have an example of that speculative play on the significance of numbers so beloved in antiquity and not despised among Christians[32]. Obedience to the Law is stressed in the Psalms and the Prophets (quotations: Ps. 19:8 and Mal. 4:4), and Jesus also observed the Law when He sent the cleansed leper to the priests (Mt. 8:4). For by submitting Himself to the command of Lev. 13:2 He showed that He had not come to undo the Law, but He did teach the distinction between the Law and the Second Legislation, Δευτέρωσις (this argument is grounded on the words 'for a testimony unto them'). He came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets (Mt. 5:17). The law is everlasting, but (and here the author makes capital out of his limited definition of the Law) the Second Legislation is dissoluble. Mt. 17:3 is also pressed into service for his argument. The Law consisted of the Decalogue and the "Judgments" (Exod. 21:1), both of which were given by God before the people fell into idolatry when they worshipped the Golden Calf (equated with Apis in *Ap. Const.* VI 20:1). This Law is no burden; there is nothing there about distinction of meats, offerings of incense, animal sacrifices or burnt offerings. In this Law He is concerned only with the ordering of the Church and with the uncircumcision. Concerning sacrifices God's word is only conditional, which is demonstrated from Exod. 20:24-25, "*if* thou shalt make an altar...". The reference in these verses to an iron instrument is interpreted by the writer as meaning not a stonemason's axe but the knife used for circumcision. For God has no need of sacrifices. From this text, much favoured in early Christian polemic against sacrifices[33], the writer proceeds to an ingenious use of Scriptural argument, though it remains somewhat strange to learn that Noah was reprimanded by God because he offered a sacrifice.

Briefly the author reminds his readers of the goodness of God towards His People touching upon the deliverance out of Egypt, the pilgrimage through the desert and the giving of the Law. Sharply contrasted with

this is the apostasy of Israel. The account in Exodus 32 is exploited to the full in support of his argument that God in His wrath, yet also as a sign of His loving-kindness and mercy, bound them with the Second Legislation consisting of heavy burdens and direct commandments too numerous to mention, now no longer conditional as heretofore[34]. Because the Jews failed to keep these commands, they were struck with blindness, as Is. 57:12 also underlines, so that, reading in their Law that anyone who hangs on a tree is cursed, they might reckon Jesus accursed. This ever growing blindness is also attested to in Is. 6:9 and continued into the time of Jesus (Mt. 13:15). The beatitude which follows in Mt. 13:16 refers to Christians. For them the Second Legislation, which was a punishment for idolatry, is no longer valid, because they were set free from idolatry when they broke in Baptism with Satan and his service[35]. That has been the effect of Christ's coming (this is the context of my quotation in the introduction). Old Testament texts frequently used against the sacrificial system (Jer. 6:20, 7:21-22, Is. 1:11-14) are also shown to be prophecy fulfilled. The coming of Christ totally destroyed the Second Legislation. Christ would have nothing to do with washings and with sacrifices[36]—a convenient use of the argument from silence in the Gospels. At this point the author refers to the Saviour's call in Mt. 11:28. This word spoken to the weary and heavy-laden is not meant for the Gentiles but for "us, His disciples among the Jews," (elsewhere in this treatise this text is similarly used). Whoever refuses to be freed from this burden through Christ is disobedient towards God. Our Lord and Saviour, Who is Himself the Giver both of the Law and of the Second Legislation, also clearly indicated the difference in various places. By a for us somewhat forced but typically Eastern manner of exegesis based solely on those words which he needs for his purpose he "proves" his point with words from Psalms 1 and 2[37]. Ezekiel 20 with its references to various kinds of law is also put to good use. The woe pronounced in Is. 5:18 upon those who make their sins as a long rope refers to such as these. Whoever strives to be under the Second Legislation unites himself with the idolaters and pronounces with them the curse upon the Crucified, is in fact an enemy of God.

Then the preacher comes to his application. If that is the status of the Second Legislation, why then is the Sabbath exalted above Sunday on the grounds of Exod. 20:11 by "you who from among the People have believed" (Connolly p. 233)? The author counters with a reference to Genesis 1, esp. verse 5: "et factus est dies unus". That which already exists, he boldly affirms to be greater than the unknown future. Moreover Scripture shows that it is the first-born who are blessed. Then follows an argument intended to strengthen their faith and clarify their

position. It excels, alas, in producing confusion. Texts are strung together without any inner logic or cohesion. Connolly has rightly pointed out that a comparison with the treatment of this theme in Barnabas 15 is a considerable help. Even an apocryphal saying is pressed into service to prove that the first and the last days are equal. From one Sabbath up to and including the next is 8 days; that way you arrive at the first day of the week! Moreover every day is the Lord's Day; the Patriarchs also did not observe the Sabbath. Even God Himself works on that day and does not cease from keeping nature going! The Sabbath is like so many institutions a type, i.e. of the final rest in the seven thousandth year[38]. When the Saviour came He explained these types; and those other commandments which "cannot give life" he has abolished.

The authority enjoyed by Rome is also adduced as a proof of this contrast. It is strong because it is supported by the Law (the Apost. Constitutions both here and in similar instances correctly speak of the "natural Law"). The argument based on the authority of Rome is turned in yet another direction as an argument against the maintenance of rules governing sacrifice. For anyone wanting to observe the Second Legislation in this respect will come into conflict with that authority and will find it impossible to fulfil his obligations. Because of this he will draw a curse upon himself for it is written: "A curse upon any man who does not fulfil this law by doing all that it prescribes" (Deut. 27:26). Once again the conclusion is drawn that the consequence is enmity with God. Rather let men follow Christ and thereby share in His blessings. For in the Gospel the Law and the Prophets are fulfilled, i.e. confirmed. All heretics must be avoided; they do not follow the Law and the Prophets and do not obey God but are his enemies. Wherein specifically does their heresy manifest itself? In that they abstain from meats, forbid marriage, do not believe in the Resurrection of the body, but give themselves over to all sorts of spiritualist practices. Their lot will be hell.

"But" there is another group of people to be distinguished from these. Now the author comes to his second major theme. Connolly rightly observes on p. XXXV: "We seem to get to the root of the trouble and the reason for the whole of this impassioned attack on the Deuterosis", even though he failed in the remainder of his book to draw those conclusions from this which can and ought to be drawn. There appears to be a "scrupulous" group (*A. C.* VI 27:1 παρατηρούμενοι) keeping strictly to the observance of the Second Legislation, and this makes an extensive refutation necessary. They "observe the wonted courses of nature and issues and marriage intercourse"[39]. But of them also it is true, that in observing the Second Legislation they affirm the curse against Christ. Moreover,

what about the times when they abstain from prayer, from receiving the Eucharist (sic) and from contact with the Holy Bible[40]? And are they, who through Baptism have received the Holy Spirit, without Him?[41] For the Holy Spirit remains ever with those who work righteousness and is not lost through natural sexual causes. The argument is particularly applied to women who believe that they lose the Holy Spirit in the period of menstruation. With great seriousness the author drives home the consequences of such a view; should they die in that period, they would depart without hope. If, on the other hand, the Holy Spirit is ever within them, then they have no right to absent themselves from church life. For prayer, the Eucharist and the reading of Scripture are all fruits of the Spirit. Foolish and blind (Mt. 23:18ff) are they who make a division here between the Holy One and His works. The dilemma is posed as sharply as possible on the grounds of their Baptism. Either you possess the Holy Spirit and work the works of righteousness or He is not in you and you are then prey to the unclean spirits. Neutrality is not possible, as the writer emphasises by referring to Mt. 12:43-45 and expounding it (ἄνυδροι τόποι, i.e. 'places where there is no water for baptism'!). By their wilful ideas and observances these women run the danger of everlasting damnation. And, then again, what happens after the seven-day period? Either the woman counts herself defiled in accordance with Lev. 15:19ff and needs to be washed clean: but in that case she denies the once-for-all nature of Baptism (note the play on βάπτισμα!), which brings complete forgiveness, and so remains in sin or, if she does not wash herself clean, she remains unclean on her own premise and the observance of the seven days' abstinence will have been of no avail. A further practical objection is that these observances waste an enormous amount of time (e.g. if one were to comply with all the regulations covering purification after sexual intercourse (Lev. 15:16ff), one would be forever busy cleansing clothes, bedding etc.). But then one ought to be consistent and not to wear leather shoes; for these are made of the skin of a dead animal and contact with anything "dead" makes unclean. To tread on a mouse (Lev. 11:29) or a bone or to enter a tomb (Num. 19:16ff) will mean uncleanness and involve washing. In this way one will never be clean! Repeating an earlier assertion, he warns of the dire consequences of the observance of the Second Legislation. He urges his beloved not to take upon themselves again the yoke which Christ has removed. They are not to dwell on all this uncleanness nor to abstain from church life because of this or to seek constantly after purification. In the Second Legislation (Num. 19:16ff) washing was required after touching a corpse or entering a tomb. In accordance with the Gospel and in the power of the Holy Spirit Christians will come together in the cemeteries in order even there to read the

Scriptures, make supplication to God and offer an acceptable Eucharist[42]. For "He is not God of the dead but of the living" (Mt. 22:32); for even in death the Holy Spirit is with the believer. Women, also, during the period of menstruation are not unclean, as the story of the woman with an issue of blood (Mt. 9:20ff) proves. On the contrary the husbands are with fine psychological insight urged to give extra care to their wives at such times. Natural sexual issues do not separate a man from God; after Baptism one remains truly cleansed without need for further purification. But adultery and fornication are sins and these cannot be washed clean by all the waters of the sea.

Therefore, concludes our author, avoid all such foolish observances; keep your marriage and your bodies pure, so that you may receive life.

The author adds that he could have given further proofs and refutations to clarify his teaching but that he did not want to prolong his book. The treatise finishes with the observation that this teaching may sound harsh to some ears but that it is so of necessity. As a good shepherd of the flock he points out that some might indeed have found his teaching more pleasant, had he written in a more indulgent vein, but that might easily have led to a weakening of faith. Bitter medicine is sometimes necessary. All this flows into a doxology which has strong echoes of the second article of the Apostles' Creed. By adding these concluding remarks to this summary I want to demonstrate once again that the author was aware of the need to speak with authority in a situation of dire need.

It has been good in this summary to let the Didascalia speak for itself. The analysis may as a result have been rather lengthy, but it may hopefully serve to illustrate the characteristic manner in which this treatise tackles a controversial issue of immediate relevance to life by constant reiteration, some strange twists of thought and far-fetched exposition of Biblical quotations. Thus to have gained an impressionistic "feel" of the whole work will prove to be advantageous.

We should be clear, however, that this style is not peculiar to this author but is characteristic of the period and of Eastern (Christian) writing in general. It will be helpful for us, who tend to prefer a systematic development of ideas, to give a summary of the main points in this work. Before I do so, however, I would briefly like to remind readers that the Didascalia also discusses the relationship between the Law and the Second Legislation in various other places, albeit only in passing. These passages offer no further support for the author's argument; they serve to confirm the arguments of chapter 26 and at the same time underline the fundamental importance of this issue for the author.

1. One such reference meets us in the opening paragraphs[43]. Warning his readers against covetousness by reminding them of the tenth

Commandment the author declares that Christ in the Gospel renews, confirms and fulfils the Ten Commandments. He quotes Mt. 5:27ff, arguing that the "I" who adds the "but" to the Commandment is He, who in the Law spoke through Moses, but now speaks openly in His own Person.

2. In that same first chapter, which contains a series of exhortations, he warns against the reading of heathen books[44] and men are encouraged rather to read the Holy Scriptures, i.e. the Old Testament and the Gospel (!), which is its fulfilment. For in the Old Testament writings one may find all that is needed: there is no lack in God's Word, which requires to be supplemented by heathen fables. Nevertheless a cautionary note needs to be sounded; when reading the Law, beware of the Second Legislation. Its sole purpose for the Christian is to spur him to gratitude, because by God's mercy he has been set free from its demands. This is then argued in the same manner as in Chapter 26[45], though much more briefly.
3. The duties of a bishop are discussed in chapter 4. One of the most important is diligent study of the Scriptures, so that the bishop can interpret and expound them fittingly[46] showing that the Law and the Prophets are in accord with the Gospel[47]. Above all he must be able clearly to distinguish the Law from the Second Legislation, so as to point out the characteristic difference between believer and unbeliever, lest anyone under his authority should lay upon himself heavy burdens and become a son of perdition. This theme is not developed here but such ideas are by now not unfamiliar to us[48].
4. That gratitude, which springs from knowing that you are set free from the burden of the Second Legislation must lead to joyful almsgiving to the bishop for the poor[49]; for this offering takes the place of all those other offerings prescribed in the Law and listed by the author in full detail[50].
5. A similar argument is to be found at the beginning[51] of this chapter which deals with the respect due to the clergy from the laity. The sacrifices prescribed under the Old Dispensation are now replaced by prayers, petitions and thanksgivings, the first fruits and the tithes by the προσφοραί which are offered through the bishops to the Lord God.
6. Finally, it is important to note that the author narrates how the Apostles on returning to their Churches from their missionary journeys found a widespread observance of the Second Legislation[52] in all sorts of ways. The whole church was thereby in danger of falling into heresy. The Apostolic Teaching, which is said to have been formulated in response to this situation, includes the confes-

sion of the Trinity, the proper use of Holy Scripture, belief in the Resurrection of the dead[53], permission to make use of all God's creatures, stress on the sanctity of marriage, the circumcision of the heart and the sufficiency of one Baptism. An extended quotation is appended to this from Acts 15. Freedom from the Law, advocated by Peter and accepted by James the Just, was thus well known to the author and he makes grateful use of it. But that sheds a clearer light upon Chapter 26. This Word from Scripture was obviously not sufficient; additional teaching (and what an addition!) with a strong theoretical foundation was necessary.

If we now attempt a summary of the line of thought in the Didascalia, we find that the author is writing against heretics, who desire to take upon themselves as a norm the observance of the ritual laws of the Pentateuch.

Christ has declared this Law through Moses; but the conclusion drawn from this by these Christians is to be rejected, as this Second Legislation is no longer valid since the coming of Christ. For, the Didascalia argues, there is a sharp distinction between the Law-Decalogue and the Judgements, the "natural Law", which the Patriarchs also obeyed in their service of God, on the one hand, and the Δευτέρωσις on the other hand, which was imposed because of idolatry, a heavy burden serving both as punishment and mercy. The observance of this Second Legislation is attacked on the following grounds:

a) God has no need of the offerings prescribed in it.
b) Observance of the Second Legislation implies an admission of guilt like that which provoked it.
c) Thereby one also concurs in the cursing of Jesus (Deut. 21:23 = Gal. 3:13).
d) The Second Legislation is temporary, because it can today no longer be maintained and implemented.
e) Christ has destroyed idolatry and broken the bonds.

In Baptism the Christian has received the washing away of sins and new life in the service of Christ, filled with the Holy Spirit. Thus the "baptismal" purifications prescribed in the Law are past. God has abandoned the Jews and taken up His abode in the Church[54]. The identity of the Church as the New People of God replacing the Old People is also demonstrated by the fact that the Jews are now as the heathen; the Holy Spirit has abandoned them and Satan rules over them; now Satan also seeks to bring schism into the Church. It is interesting to note that the author has nothing to say about the manner in which Christ has

destroyed the Second Legislation: the bare fact of His coming is already sufficient. Nothing is said in all this about the Cross.

Christians now live under one mild Law, the so-called negative Golden Rule: "what thou hatest that it should be done to thee by another, thou do not to another"[55]. The replacement of the sacrificial Laws is mentioned in passing as a well-known fact. By contrast the author spends considerable time on two other points of the Law, not the usual issues of distinction of foods and circumcision but the issues of Sabbath observance and ritual washing after sexual defilement.

1. *The Sabbath*, honoured alongside Sunday. The issue of Sabbath observance has been a delicate issue in the Christian community from of old to this very day. Properly speaking, it cannot be treated as a matter for discussion as the institution of the Sabbath belongs, of course, to the Decalogue (Fourth Commandment), and not to the Second Legislation, and is therefore beyond dispute. It is important to draw attention to this fact, if we are to have a proper evaluation of the task facing the author of the Didascalia. What can be attributed to the Second Legislation are the various Sabbath prescriptions mentioned elsewhere in the Didascalia[56], such as the prohibition against kindling light, preparing food etc. (What the Jews consider to be joyful is here described as mourning!)[57] Moreover the argument in this part of chapter 26 is fairly confused and would, as Connolly has rightly pointed out, be virtually unintelligible without the clarification afforded by a comparison with the Epistle of Barnabas, chapter 15. We ought to note, then, that, while the author does not simply abolish the Sabbath, he does suddenly avail himself of the early Christian concept of the "type" (the Sabbath prefigures the eternal rest)[58], a line of argument he does not use anywhere else in his treatment of the Law. This can in no way be explained as an interpolation: the style far too clearly betrays the hand of our author by its obvious similarity to the rest of the work. Nevertheless this incongruity of approach, which moreover does not easily fit in with the line of attack set out at the start of the chapter, seems to me to indicate clearly, that the author was moved to write by the need to combat current practices rather than by a fondness for theorising.
2. *Ritual washings after sexual defilement.*
When we observe that about a third of this chapter is devoted to this issue and sense the urgent note in the arguments in which the reminder of nothing less than Baptism as *the* foundation fact of the Christian life is a major factor; when, moreover, we see the particular attention paid to the sprinklings in virtually identical

wording on pages 216 and 252 and note on p. 238 that amongst those prescriptions of the Second Legislation which cannot be carried out under Roman rule, apart from stoning and sacrifices, only the sprinkling with the ashes of a red heifer (Nu. 19)[59] is mentioned and referred to again later on in the list of causes of ritual defilement (see Analysis),—then it becomes clear that this is far more than just one example among many of the requirements of the Deuterosis. Almost no other matters are discussed; this, however, is treated with great emphasis. Once again we are driven to the conclusion that the concrete demands of the moment made action on *this particular* issue a necessity.

In this 26th chapter of the Didascalia we touch upon the problem of the place of the Old Testament in the Christian Church. In his doctoral dissertation for the Free University of Amsterdam Dr. Koole has produced a thoroughly detailed and excellent study of the difficulties presented by the Old Testament for the early Christian Church[60]. I intend, therefore, to leave on one side the controversy over the validity of the Old Testament. The patristic writers countered the arguments of those who considered it abolished by insisting primarily on the unity of the old and the new covenants, using either allegory or typology to make the point whenever the literal sense could not sustain it. However, we need to recognise that this standpoint by no means removed all difficulties. For the cardinal issue remains, namely what is one to do with the Law? The narrative parts can be treated either historically or as example. The prophets were heralds of Christ. But the prescriptions of the Law, which occupy such a prominent place in the Old Testament, did not prove so easy to handle. On the contrary, they tended to handle men. Jewish Christians continued to cling to the Law. But was this Revelation then still valid for "Israel after the spirit"? More than any other this controversy has been a source of problems and divisions in the Church. The Law was the delight of James, the Brother of our Lord, but Peter's burden and Paul's cross. On this crucial issue, which proved to be of such vital importance for the practical ordering of the Church and the life of its members and to which so many pages both of the New Testament and the patristic authors address themselves, the Didascalia also takes its distinctive stance.

We have already outlined the position arrived at by our author vis à vis the Law. He celebrates a Gospel free from law. Quite definitely there is no question of abrogating the Old Testament as a whole. It is frequently quoted as addressed to Christians and time and again such quotations are introduced with "as the Lord has said ...". The words of the prophets are still normative. The historical narratives are adduced as examples

encouraging virtue or restraining from wickedness, e.g. the story of Korach, Dathan and Abiram, the traditional types of the schismatics[61] or Miriam as an example of repentance and forgiveness[62]. Particularly striking is his use of the Tabernacle as a type of the Church of God[63] and the close parallel he draws between the Christian clergy and the Old Testament priests[64]. These are concepts which one can already find in 1 Clement and which have gained common currency in the Church[65].

Within the theoretical framework of the Didascalia this piece of ritual law presents no problems: for it had already been delivered before that fateful and regrettable day of the Golden Calf. Everything said about priests in the Law remains valid. Hence the otherwise puzzling acceptance of the injunction in Lev. 21:17, that a priest is to be without physical blemish[66]. Christ also submitted himself to the priests as prescribed in the Law, though he added instruction concerning the Second Legislation[67]. The gifts for the priests remain in force as once upon a time the tithe was valid[68]. If one is to follow this author, then it would appear that everything after Exodus 32 is abrogated by the coming of Christ. But the matter is not so simple. When we study the Old Testament quotations in the Didascalia, we notice that the author sometimes also cites with approval from Leviticus and Deuteronomy: e.g. the saying about blessing and cursing from Numbers 24 quoted four times with the reference provided[69]. It is, however, not to be forgotten that he immediately adds a saying from the Gospels confirming the matter. The other quotations are moral prescriptions. In the light of these considerations the point of the stress on the ability to distinguish between the Law and the Second Legislation as one of the duties of a bishop becomes clear. The distinction is not so easily maintained and the ability to expound the Law according to the Gospel (Clement of Alexandria's "ecclesiastical canon"!) demands much study. It is impossible to give a general definition of those matters which do or do not belong to the Deuterosis. The *literal* fulfilment of all the sacrifices, purification rites, food laws and punishments prescribed has been abolished. Wherever church tradition or the prophetic part of the Old Testament, which he clearly knows very thoroughly, had given a 'spiritual' interpretation, this is adopted by the author. Thus he mentions only in passing those sacrifices, which God does not require, but which have been 'spiritualised' in the Christian Church as prayers offered to God. From the author's argument that God had, according to the "true" law, only required sacrifices conditionally one can see how lightly the concept of sacrifice was regarded (p. 220). The concept that sacrifices have been replaced by Christian prayers is, of course, not the author's own. These are the "spiritual sacrifices" of 1 Peter 2:5[70]. Tertullian speaks in similar vein[71], and the concept may also

be found in Judaism[72]. What is distinctive is that the Eucharist is not compared with Old Testament sacrifices[73]. The only place which Connolly cites[74], i.e. p. 86, admittedly uses the word (the Old Testament sacrifices are now replaced by prayers, petitions and thanksgivings, εὐχαὶ καὶ δεήσεις καὶ εὐχαριστίαι *A. C.*, II 26:2), but the parallel with Paul's words in Phil. 4:6 is so striking, that a reference to the Lord's Supper cannot be found in this passage, even less so, when εὐχαριστία is by no means always used as a technical term in patristic literature. Both the Law and the Second Legislation, then, have been given by God, the former to all men, the latter to Israel only because of their idolatry, both as a punishment and in order to restrain them from yet greater evil. The point of transition is Exodus 32. All the ritual described in the subsequent chapters and books is no longer valid in a literal sense (the point at stake in the whole controversy!) and in a "spiritual" sense only in so far as it is a consequence of the general Law and has been accepted in the tradition of the church.

I want to emphasise this connection with the generally accepted thinking of the Church of his time. Certain ideas, which would have been of prime importance in a purely theoretical discussion of the issue, are passed over by the author, because they are generally accepted, also by his opponents, and his practical aim was not to enter into the controversy about the Law but to deal with certain consequences drawn from it. I stress this point all the more, because Connolly does not give sufficient weight to this and as a result his comments on the Law fail to set matters in a proper perspective[75].

Naturally Achelis has also concerned himself with this issue. Quite correctly he emphasised that the author's purpose in writing was entirely practical. He argued that the Old Testament ritual was of no interest to the author except in so far as it affected his own congregation. "Es kommt ihm gar nicht auf das Opferritual an, das der Vergangenheit angehört, sondern auf die Kathartik, die er zu seinem Bedauern nicht ausrotten konnte". The theory concerning the Second Legislation was designed to provide doctrinal support, as his opponents constantly trotted out the Law whenever he attacked circumcision, observance of the Sabbath and purificatory rites. The dilemma posed for him then became: either reject Scripture or agree with his opponents. "Aus dieser Not ist ihm die historisch-dogmatische Theorie über das alttestamentliche Gesetz entstanden. Sie leistete wirklich, was er wünschte. Er konnte vom Inhalt des Alten Testaments beibehalten, was ihm beliebte, und verwerfen, was ihm nicht passte"[76]. Again Achelis expresses his view as follows: "Wie sehr dem Verfasser der Kampf gegen das Judenchristentum am Herzen liegt, sieht man daran, dass er sich durch dasselbe zu

dem einzigen theologischen Gedankengang hat drängen lassen, der ihm eigenthümlich ist, freilich einem ganz wunderbaren Gebilde, das deutlich den Kopf eines Laien verrät''[77]. Achelis agrees, then, in arguing for a practical aim, but considers that the theory was invented *a posteriori* by the author, who was a layman, and that it was directed against Jewish Christianity; this theory would, it is argued, enable him to play fast and loose with the Old Testament. These opinions, which Achelis does not support with any evidence, are entirely mistaken, suffer from a failure to analyse this treatise accurately, are based on impressions and can in fact be contradicted by the texts. Achelis is not the only one to regard the teaching of the Didascalia as freakish. The author of that indispensable work, ''Neutestamentliche Apokryphen'', Hennecke, actually wrote that the viewpoint of the author is extraordinarily daring and cannot be matched in the whole history of Old Testament interpretation[78]. It is astonishing to find such statements made by expert patristic scholars for the verdict is quite mistaken. Connolly has already replied to this in several places in his introduction but has in my view not dealt with the issue sufficiently. In order to reach a proper appreciation, we will now have a closer look at both the author's theory and the practical issues raised by him and compare them with other relevant historical data.

A. It is certainly true, that the use of the word, Δευτέρωσις, is strange. Whenever it appears elsewhere it refers either to the book Deuteronomy[79] or is used of the Jewish application of the Law (the Mishnah), while here it clearly means something entirely different[80]. This use is, however, in no way unintelligible. For God did after all according to Exodus deliver the Law a second time.

It is beyond the scope of this study to describe at length the various views which have been current in the early church concerning the Law[81]. We will simply adumbrate the most important concepts.

Quite clearly the Didascalia will have nothing to do with the radical ideas favoured in Marcionite circles. It upholds the Law as a God-given, albeit historical, entity. Again it is obvious that it does not intend to uphold the Pentateuch as necessary for Salvation, as happened in the circles round James the Just. Where, then, does one find the ideas characteristic of the Didascalia? Not in Paul. His treatment of the problem in Galatians and Romans is entirely different, which is not surprising, as the point at issue here is the opposition of Law and Faith as the means of Justification; moreover Paul is not discussing Israel but mankind. The Law brings man to the knowledge of sin and binds him until the coming of Christ. Paul, like our author, reaches back beyond Sinai to Abraham, the father of the believers, and speaks in well-known words of the Gentiles who have ''the Law inscribed on their hearts'', but

there is no trace here of a natural law = the Decalogue and Judgements, nor do we find the typological application of the prescriptions of the Law to the church and its ministers. With the coming of Christ one stands within the fulfilment of the promises of God, set free, no longer under the Law but under grace. In one word, the moral prescriptions have been fulfilled. Everything has become new for him who is in Christ. In his personal conduct Paul observed the Law[82], for he who has been called within the circumcision must not set that at nought and he who is called within the uncircumcision must not seek to be circumcised. For only the keeping of the commandments, faith active in love, has any power. In his inner life Paul has been set free from the Law. Gentiles in Galatia were converted through the preaching of faith; that was the work of the Spirit; but after that they turned towards some sort of super-Christianity by accepting circumcision in the flesh. In reality, however, they subjected themselves thereby once again to idols (NB the text from Deut. favoured by the Didascalia is also used here!), to the service of the elemental spirits of the universe by their observance of special days and months etc. In this connection we also need to consider Col. 2. To be baptised into Christ's death was to die to the spiritual powers of the universe, which had been conquered by the cross (a point not made in the Didascalia); thereby that spiritual circumcision which is the laying down of our sinful nature has been made possible. For this reason the Colossians are not to be confused by idle talk about what one is allowed to eat or to drink, about the observance of Jewish festivals and Sabbath; these are no more than pointers to the reality of Christ.

When, however, we compare Paul with the Didascalia, we can see that the outcome of their arguments is much the same. Admittedly there is a considerable difference in the lines of argument that lead to this conclusion; thus there is no mention in Paul of the significance of the episode in Exod. 32 which is a strong characteristic of the Didascalia. We need, however, to give due weight to the span of time separating them. Paul lives within an eschatological tension while the Didascalia is written while the institutional church is developing. Paul concentrates entirely on the significance of Christ for the justification of both Jew and Gentile and on the role to be assigned to the Law within this framework, while the Didascalia is addressed to Christians, for whom the unique salvational significance of Jesus Christ is not in dispute but who believe themselves bound to uphold the Law as God's command. The point of contact with Colossians is particularly striking, and the Didascalia in fact draws out the implications of Paul's line of thought.

The Law is also extensively discussed in the Epistle to the Hebrews but always from the point of view of atonement. All the prescriptions of the

Law are prophetically symbolic of Christ's coming to be sacrificed. No other function of the Law is discussed. The discussion is thus conducted in an entirely different dimension and cannot therefore be compared with that of the Didascalia. The matter is rather different when we come to the Epistle of Barnabas[83]. We cannot afford to devote much space to the confused connection and interpretation of various Old Testament passages. In some respects his views are like those of the Didascalia, e.g. concerning the abolition of sacrifice, where both authors use the same passages from the prophets, although they differ in their application. Christ gave a new law without the yoke of necessity. We have already discussed their similarities with regard to the Sabbath. Again, twice over we find mention of the episode of Israel's sin in worshipping the Calf. But, and here we strike a fundamental difference, the breaking of the Law did not lead to a Deuterosis but cut the bond with the Jews. Ever since Sinai they have stood outside the covenant and have read the law with a veil. For the Law points to Jesus in types. Jesus came to bring the sins of the Jews to their fulfilment. Again Barnabas speaks of the true circumcision. The food laws refer to the distinction between believers and unbelievers. Thus the Law falls into disuse, becomes type or allegory, has never had a literal meaning. It has no validity for the Church either. The "Way of Life" is very different. One can see, that this line of thought is totally different from that developed in the Didascalia.

Ignatius had no need to pay careful attention to this issue. Nevertheless we find that he twice used the word ἰουδαϊσμός. In *Magn.* 8:1, he maintains that those who continue to live according to Judaism have not yet received grace, and it becomes clear subsequently that he is particularly concerned with those who want to observe the Sabbath instead of Sunday[84]. The issue of Judaism appears again in *Philad.* 6:1 and in a very striking way: ἄμεινον γάρ ἐστιν παρὰ ἀνδρὸς περιτομὴν ἔχοντος χριστιανισμὸν ἀκούειν ἢ παρὰ ἀκροβύστου ἰουδαϊσμόν. Judaising tendencies appear to have been advocated not by Jewish Christians but by Gentile Christians! Thus he alluded to the sharp contradiction but otherwise did not declare himself either concerning a Christian interpretation of the Law or on its abrogation.

It is obvious, that Justin Martyr could scarcely avoid a discussion of the problem of the Law in his *Dialogue with the Jew Trypho* (*c.* 160)[85]. His task is to demonstrate that Christians are in the right when they do not observe the Law of the forefathers, because the Law of Christ has taken its place. The prophets are put to good use in the debate; they spoke of a new covenant, which has been fulfilled in Christ. In Him spiritual values are no longer symbolic images but have been realised, for He is Himself the lawgiver. Righteousness cannot be gained by the works of the Law,

its ritual, but only by Christ's death on the Cross and his Baptism. Christians would have observed all these prescriptions, had they not known that these were instituted because of the transgression of the Jews in their worship of the Calf. In order to preserve them from idolatry God gave them the Law. The righteousness of the patriarchs proves that one can come to God without the Law. In this vein he brings to bear the withering judgements of the prophets (such as Ezek. 20 & Amos 5) on the issues of distinction of meats, the Sabbath, sacrifices, circumcision. Sometimes too the Law points towards Christ (*inter alia* the Paschal Lamb). The significance of all this is pointed out:

> "Such teachings seemed to many people to be unreasonable and unworthy of God, because they had not received the grace to perceive that God has called your people to conversion and penitence of spirit, while they walked in the way of wickedness and their souls were sick".

But Christians pray to be protected from the power of those demons whom once they served[86]. The meal offerings prefigured the Eucharist; Sunday is the first day etc. With the coming of Christ, who is the eternal Law and covenant, all this came to an end. There is no way to life outside of Christ. He shows the distinction in the Law between that which is naturally good and that which was instituted because of the hardness of men's hearts. Some commandments, e.g. the sacrificial laws, can no longer be fulfilled; that means that men can be saved without these. But then Trypho replies (c. 46) that it is essential to observe the Sabbath, circumcision, times and seasons and to wash oneself clean after touching anything unclean and after sexual intercourse. All this, says Justin, was given by God as a constant reminder against idolatry, which Israel continued to practise. The Christians on the other hand will even endure torture (in time of persecution!) for refusing to offer sacrifices and do so in the hope of eternal life. The rest contributes nothing to Salvation. Justin does know of Christians who with Christ wish to observe Jewish laws. He acknowledges them as brothers so long as they regard this as a private option but not if in so doing they curtail the glory of Christ.

I have given an extensive summary of these arguments which play such an important part in Justin Martyr's Dialogue, not in order to criticise them as Harnack has done[87] but because of their close similarity to those of the Didascalia. Of course there are also differences. For while Justin is dealing with Jews and is therefore bound to have the all-sufficiency of Christ, the prediction of his coming and his redemption, at the heart of his case, the Didascalia is concerned with the question whether the Law is still valid in its entirety for Christians. But the leading concepts are the same, even though they are applied differently. It is not

possible to decide the origin of this approach to the Law. Is Justin himself the originator or has he perhaps imported it from his native Palestine[88]? One does, of course, encounter in Justin various ideas which crop up elsewhere, such as those parts of the Old Testament which are understood to prefigure Christ and the abolition of ritual, but it is with him that we first come across the concept of the Law given after the turning-point of Exod. 32. It is strange that neither Achelis nor Hennecke, Connolly nor Burkitt have paid any attention to this attempt to solve the problem of the Law, the more surprising in Connolly's case as he does draw the comparison in their treatment of the Sabbath question[89].

A similar standpoint is to be discovered in the fourth book of the treatise against heretics of Irenaeus, Bishop of Lyons, (*c.* 180). It is of course well-known that Irenaeus made use of the works of Justin[90]. The basic approach in this instance is the same with such variations as were dictated by circumstances. This is understandable, as Irenaeus was battling on another front, i.e. against Marcion and the Gnostics, who taught that the Law originated from an inferior God. Against this position Irenaeus states that "the words of Moses are those of Christ"[91]. In debate with the Jews Justin only made use of the Old Testament, whereas Irenaeus, because the Gnostics primarily based their case on the words and deeds of Jesus (see the treatment below of the letter of Ptolemaeus to Flora), has to comment on this also. His position can be outlined briefly as follows: God had at first warned the Jews through natural prescriptions, which He had implanted in men from the beginning, i.e. through the Decalogue, which one had to fulfil or run the risk of forfeiting salvation. When the Jews introduced the worship of the Calf, they showed their desire for the bondage of Egypt. For that reason God laid upon them the yoke of the bonds (also supported by reference to Ezek. 20). This was not delivered by some other God but God adapted Himself to the needs of the Jews due to the hardness of their hearts. The Apostles have also given commandments in order to counter the weakness of human nature; assuredly God likewise acted thus in order to preserve the Jews from idolatry. The commandments and acts of Christ did not abrogate the Old Testament Law, as the Gnostics asserted, but broke the bonds of the Law by means of fulfilment (Mt. 5) and reintroduced the natural law. The Law had significance as a teacher pointing men by way of earthly matters to the heavenly, that men might learn to worship God and to come to Christ. The Law also has typical significance. The Jews had the beginning, Christians had the full fruit; the New Testament is greater in glory than the Old Testament. Christ is the end of the Law in the double sense and that end is freedom in Christ.

For those who have been redeemed the Mosaic Law is no longer valid[92]. Circumcision and Sabbath were signs. God needs no sacrifices but gratitude expresses itself in the Eucharist, sacrifice in another form.

These ideas are supported with extensive arguments and a wealth of quotations with that constant repetition which is such a feature of Irenaeus' style. That he makes no mention of ritual washings is not surprising in view of his opponents. In Irenaeus not the Law's practicability but its validity as part of the Old Testament is at stake. Otherwise the difference of ideas between Irenaeus and the Didascalia is here marginal. (Connolly rightly points out that, while Irenaeus lays more emphasis on the educative significance of the Law, not too much weight ought to be given to this in view of the different battle-fronts[93].) In other words, both approaches concur. The similarity between Justin/Irenaeus and the Didascalia is very striking. It is of course arguable that the author of the Didascalia was acquainted with Irenaeus (thus Connolly, but with too few supporting facts) or with Justin. Alternatively, should we reckon with the possibility that we have before us some traditional teaching, certain key passages from the Law and the Prophets against Jewish ritual adapted in various ways to meet different situations? A glance at the use of proof-texts, in which the same texts tend to recur, would argue for this possibility. On the other hand the connection between the texts is not sufficiently settled to enable one to discern fixed groupings. One needs to bear in mind the additions, re-arrangements, and applications of the texts. Such a possibility would lead to a modification of the Testimonia theory advanced by Rendel Harris[94], though I myself would not agree that such a collection existed in book-form before the New Testament.

Further support for this idea could be adduced from the fact, that Clement of Alexandria (*c.* 200) also appears to be aware of this approach to the Law. In his *Paedagogus* he addresses the Greeks and in passing mentions briefly the temporal nature of the Old Testament Law[95], which was given for the sake of rebellious children (note the allusion to Exod. 32) to prevent transgression and encourage obedience to Christ. For him the Law brings knowledge of sin that drives men to Christ. It is the source of all moral teaching, suitably spiritualised of course: the sacrifices he reckons to be figures of the piety of Christians. Apart from this he does not go into this question, which was typical of anti-Jewish polemic, at any length. Where he does touch on the issue[96], he treats it in an entirely different manner from that of Justin or Irenaeus (he divides the Mosaic Law into four parts[97]). Precisely because this is the case, it is highly significant that he also appears to know of a tradition involving Exod. 32.

When we survey in these examples how the Law has been considered in the Church, then we may observe that the author of the Didascalia

follows a road also trodden by others (it was not the only road, of course) and that he travels in fairly good company. All the characteristic elements of his approach as well as their connection with each other are to be found in Justin and Irenaeus[98]. The verdict reached by Achelis and Hennecke appears to have no foundation; the arguments are not, after all, so bizarre and certainly not invented "pour besoin de la cause". The problem of the ritual law is in principle dealt with in similar fashion, though the application and the accents typical of each author are occasioned by the needs of the moment. In Justin, Irenaeus (Clement) it is clear which opponents are under fire. But against whom does the Didascalia speak? From what adversaries does it derive its distinctive colouring? To answer that we shall need to turn to a study of the practical application of this work.

Before we proceed to this, a quick word about a view advanced by both Connolly and Burkitt[99], comparing our treatise with the letter of Ptolemaeus to Flora[100]. The latter sees the similarity especially in the temporary element in the Law, which both assume. I find it puzzling that someone of Burkitt's standing can make such a superficial judgement. For, surely, both the purpose and the method of the two documents are entirely different; this "temporary element" turns out to be a purely formal similarity without substance when one compares the two works. The Didascalia is in no way a modification of the theory of Ptolemaeus (*c.* 160). This "religious critique" states clearly, that God, the Father of Jesus Christ, did not give the Law, that it was imperfect (God who is Perfect cannot bring into being that which is imperfect), full of prescriptions, which are not fitting for God, even if it does not follow that the Devil is the author, as some would have it. On the basis of sayings of Christ in the Gospels, the Pentateuch is divided into three parts: passages by Moses due to the hardness of heart of the Jews (but nothing about Exod. 32!), additions by the elders, and a part from God Himself. This in its turn is divided into three parts; the true law, i.e. the Decalogue, which Christ came to fulfil, that is to bring to perfection (Mt. 5:17 is interpreted differently on this point); this is not a mixture of good and bad, as is the second part, which includes the *ius talionis* (abrogated by Christ); and thirdly, a typical part, consisting of offerings, circumcision, Sabbath, symbols all of which became reality with the appearance of the Truth (Christ). The God, who delivered this, is the Demiurge = Creator, who is to be distinguished from the God and Father of Christ.

This summary should suffice to make the difference clear[101]. Nothing is to be found here of our author's characteristic concept of "apostasy" (quite different from Ptolemaeus' hardening of the heart in IV 5ff), nor any use made of the critical material from the prophets but rather only

from the sayings of Christ. There is, it is true, considerable similarity to the ideas of various patristic writers in the symbolic section, but that should not surprise us when we keep in view the fact that the real "gnosis" is still to come (VII 9-10), a fact that is only too often ignored[102]. What does encounter us here once again is the fundamental distinction between God and the Demiurge as Lawgiver. This is not simply a matter of words but of basic reality: only those for whom God is an empty name can consider this shift of meaning insignificant. The Church, on the other hand, as Irenaeus proves, has firmly held to the one identity as *the* great fact about God. Again, the purpose of Christ's coming and of His work in relation to the Law is quite differently conceived (Ptolemaeus v 1ff) because Ptolemaeus operates with quite different categories (τέλειος -ἀδικία, οἰκεῖος - ἀνοίκειος τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ φύσει) and because of his distinction between God and Creator approaches his theme in a radically different manner. Which of the two has produced the better theology in this area is not the point under discussion. But, from a historical perpective it simply cannot be maintained that Ptolemaeus and the Didascalia are variations of the same theme.

B. Who, then, were the adversaries who provoked this extensive repudiation? Achelis reckoned that they were Jewish Christians, whose practices it proved hard to eradicate, and who were having a bad influence on Gentile Christians[103]. C. Schmidt followed him in this conclusion[104]. Connolly, however, disagreed: "Judaizing tendencies were widespread; and the presence of a purely Jewish community, from which converts to Christianity might be drawn (and the Didascalia implies such converts in appreciable numbers) would sufficiently account for the abuses of which the author chiefly complains"[105]. In his detailed study of the Baptist movement in Syria J. Thomas considers that here we have to do not so much with a separatist group of Christians as simply with some Christians who went in for all kinds of ritual washing, an attitude attacked in the Didascalia and later by John Chrysostom[106].

No light is shed on this problem by the references to the Didascalia in ancient authors[107]. The very concept of Jewish Christianity is notoriously difficult to define precisely due to the muddled sources and obscure data furnished by the patristic writers (*int. al.* Epiphanius, who is extraordinarily confused) in their controversies with heretics or by the pseudo-Clementine literature. It is true, that we find several groups who practised ritual washing[108]. On the other hand these are often linked with Christological heresies. Harnack correctly pointed out some time ago that it is wise to draw a distinction between genuine Jewish Christians, descendants of the first Palestinian Christian congregations, and the tendency, which gradually makes its appearance in the Church, to draw

more on Old Testament concepts in determining Church practice[109]. If we now examine the Didascalia itself, then we find no clue in the beginning of the whole treatise about the people to whom it is addressed. Nothing of substance is to be found in the earlier chapters. The impression left by these is that we are dealing with Christians in a pagan culture (dangers of reading wrong literature!). Several heretical views are listed and attacked in the chapter on heresies and schisms (ch. 24)[110]. These teach the abolition of the Old Testament and of belief in the resurrection of the dead; certain schismatics are also advocating abstinence from marriage, others forbid the eating of meat in accordance with Lev. 17 and desire that the Old Testament laws concerning ritual cleanness should be observed as well as circumcision. This reappears in a slightly different form in chapter 24. It is to counter such teaching that the Apostolic Council has met. What is added, is that they observe the Deuterosis[111]. Probably the author is here attacking Marcionite and Encratite currents of thought (I am using the word advisedly because it is very difficult to distinguish the various sects from one another; time and again one group adopts the ideas of another, so as not to be outbid, and transference of membership was not uncommon then, as indeed, most instructively, it is not unknown in our own country today!) Such people need to be warned and, if unrepentant, to be cut off. From these rather sketchy bits of information and from the brevity of their treatment, all the more remarkable in view of the author's normally expansive style, we may conclude that this particular danger has ebbed away. Quite different are the people in mind in chapter 26, who are guilty of mistaken practices but are clearly distinguished from the heretics, as I have indicated earlier[112]. These "scrupulous" people do not constitute a separate congregation but belong to the author's own community and are regarded by him as such, for they take part in all its normal functions[113]. The only accusation is that they still want to observe the Law in certain of its prescriptions. Such people, who are numbered with the congregation along with Gentile converts[114], are characterised as called to faith in Christ "from the People"[115]. Mistakenly, according to the Didascalia, they (continue to) observe purifications, sprinklings and washings (under one heading—ritual baptisms specially in connection with sexual issues); for, the author argues, if they intend to observe the Law, then they should also wash themselves for other reasons prescribed in the Law and keep to the distinction of meats (p. 216; on p. 252 the same list reappears but without this last item; the issue of distinction of meats is in actual fact never treated). We need to keep the distinction between these two groups clearly before us. Achelis[116] failed to do so, merged the two groups lumping their characteristics together and concluded that these must point to

Jewish Christians. This is inadmissible. For, while both groups (p. 204 and chapter 26) observe the Deuterosis, that does not make them identical.

Are we, then, to regard all the material in chapter 26 as mere padding? I see no reason for such an arbitrary course. The Apostles are portrayed to be speaking here as representatives of the New Testament Gospel, free from Law. The distinction of meats issue is settled (underlined once more with the quotation from Peter's speech in Acts 15); Baptism takes the place of circumcision, which becomes circumcision of the heart; sacrifices can no longer be offered and are replaced. For our author these points were clearly settled and no longer in need of serious treatment. The case is very different with this chapter. Here, after a theoretical exposition there is, as we have seen, an extensive treatment of basically only two issues, a) the sabbath, and b) purification laws regarding sexual matters. This is the major application of the well-known theory (see above), that the whole of the Law given after Exodus 32 was no longer valid.

It happens that we know that currents of thought appeared in the Eastern Church during the course of the third and fourth centuries (it is then that we can trace them in our relatively scarce sources) which were characterised by precisely these points of dispute.

a) With respect to this it has been the tragic misfortune of the Didascalia to have suffered a complete distortion in the version appearing in the Apostolic Constitutions, where it is made to argue the exact opposite. The Didascalia argues passionately against the Sabbath making it a day of mourning[117] and for the observance of Sunday. The Apostolic Constitutions simply regard Sabbath and Sunday as equal. The Didascalia prescribes consistently that Sunday should always be a day of joy on which one should not fast[118]; *A.C.* simply add to this "every Sabbath day except one" (Saturday of Holy Week)[119]. The same point can be noted in other passages[120], while those passages in the Didascalia, which attack the Sabbath, are either simply scrapped or else altered beyond recognition[121]. This is not an accident but is by deliberate design. We know from other sources that such parity was being advocated; to a certain extent it was actually sanctioned by the Church at the Council of Laodicea (*c.* 360), as lections were fixed then, though Christians were forbidden to yield to Judaising tendencies by making the Sabbath a day of rest, which indicates that this was being practised by some[122]. Where else could such a stream of thought have its source, as it has done among all Sabbatarians both in the past and today, except in the fourth commandment of the Law, a Law which was not deemed to have been altered by Christ *expressis verbis*?

b) It has been correctly pointed out that the Clementine Homilies also prescribe washing after coitus[123], but references to such practices are not confined to those circles (possibly Jewish Christian). The "Apostolic Tradition" of Hippolytus[124] contains a reaction to it. Moreover I want to draw attention to the appearance in the third century of an attempt to ban women from the Eucharist during menstruation. We find this in Dionysius of Alexandria (IIIrd century), who forbade it[125]. It appears again in Theophilus of Alexandria and in later centuries we hear of regulations of this nature and also of dispute concerning the issue[126]. Such regulations all spring from the well-known Eastern tendency to regard all that has to do with sexual intercourse as ritually defiling. It is not surprising to find such thinking emerge in times, when asceticism is gaining a hold in the Church (our author is remarkably sensible in this respect) and to discover its emergence particularly in monastic Jacobite circles. Once again appeal to Scripture in support of this view, whose origins are to be found in concepts wholly alien to Christianity, was not too difficult, the more so in a region which had proved the classic soil for baptismal movements[127]. We already find these practices resisted by Clement of Alexandria[128] as Judaising tendencies; later Chrysostom attacked such ritual washings. On the basis of these facts I would conclude that Connolly was correct (even if he did not argue his case) in asserting that in the Didascalia we are not dealing with an attack on Jewish Christians but rather with those so often mentioned by patristic writers[129], the so-called Judaisers, Christians who observed Jewish customs in some respects and considered that they were thereby very "pure" and true to the Bible. Such people could in view of the quotation from Ignatius[130] cited above also be Gentile Christians.

This very real danger from the influence of Judaisers (and who could know where that approach might land the Church?) is countered by our author with the mainstream Church's interpretation of the practical application of the Law and with a reminder of the great foundation fact of the Christian life in Baptism wherein Christ had set them free from the vain ways handed down by their forefathers.

I hope with this study to have made clear what the Didascalia meant by its doctrine that Christ came to destroy the Second Legislation and why this issue was raised in this treatise.

NOTES

[1] This article is a slightly expanded version of the author's Inaugural Lecture delivered at Leiden University on February 27th, 1939—published in: *Ned. Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* XXXI (1940), pp. 65-100.

[2] All quotations from the New Testament in the *New English Bible* version (O.U.P. and C.U.P. 1972) (ed.).

[3] *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, edd. O. Gebhardt, A. von Harnack, Th. Zahn, ed. 6 minor, Leipzig 1920, p. 50. For parallels see H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, Tübingen 1920, ad loc.

[4] J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, *Incarnatie en Verlossing bij Irenaeus*, 's-Gravenhage 1934.

[5] Athanasius, *De Incarnatione Verbi 54, 3*, ed. A. Robertson, London 1882, p. 85.

[6] C. Bigg, *The Christian Platonists of Alexandria*[2], Oxford 1913, p. 101, n. 6; A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengschichte*, 4th ed., Tübingen 1909, Vol. II, p. 46, n. 1-p. 47.

[7] Cf. about this expression A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 4th ed., Leipzig 1924, Vol. I, p. 259-281.

[8] ed. de Lagarde, p. 5, 1. 7-8; Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, p. 14 (about this edition and others see below).

[9] ed. de Lagarde, p. 109, I. 29-p. 110, 1.3; Connolly, p. 224.

[10] cf. the footnote, loc. cit., in Connolly.

[11] cf. A. Baumstark, *Geschichte der syrischen Literatur*, Bonn 1922, p. 174, n. 3; p. 249, n. 5; p. 252, n. 7; p. 262-263 nn.

[12] *Didascalia Apostolorum Syriace*, Lipsiae 1854. Neither on the title-page nor elsewhere will you find the name of de Lagarde. The following does, however, appear on the title-page; "L'ouvrage n'a été tiré qu'à cent exemplaires". An anastatic reprint appeared in 1911.

[13] For a record of all editions and translations see Connolly, p. xi-xxvi.

[14] H. Achelis-J. Flemming *Die Syrische Didaskalia übersetzt und erklärt*, Leipzig 1904, in: *Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, N.F. X, 2.

[15] R. H. Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Oxford 1929. Connolly gives us the English translation of the Syriac text on the even (left-hand) pages with the Latin fragments printed on the opposite page at the corresponding point in the text. This makes comparison possible at a glance and gives it a considerable edge over Funk's Latin translation (see note 16), which prints the Latin fragments in order, filling the gaps, where these occur, with a Latin translation from the Syriac. *All quotations in this article will from now on be based on Connolly's edition.*

[16] The latest edition is that by F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Paderborn 1905, Vol. 1 (Vol. II contains: *Testimonia et Scripturae propinquae*). For the issues raised by this work see: O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*[1-2], Freiburg i.Br. 1924, vol. IV, p. 262-275.

[17] See J. M. Harden, *The Ethiopic Didascalia*, London 1920, (in: *Translations of Christian Literature in Oriental Texts*), p. xi-xx; in Arabic two recensions are extant.

[18] F. Nau, quoted by H. Leclercq, 'Didascalie', in: F. Cabrol-H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, Paris 1916, vol. IV, 1, Col. 807-809.

[19] J. M. Harden, op. cit., p. xxi.

[20] I have digressed for a moment on this point because Connolly makes no mention of it. We need to note carefully that these relationships are further complicated by the fact that the Arabic and Ethiopic translations are not directly made from the Greek text and also have passed through the hands of copyists.

[21] Connolly, p. 238.

[22] F. C. Burkitt, 'The Didascalia' in: *Journal of Theological Studies*, 1930, p. 259.

[23] cf. Connolly, p. i-liv on 'The Eucharist'.

[24] Survey of contents given in Connolly, p. xxvii-xxxvi.

[25] For 'Einleitungsfragen' see Achelis, op. cit., p. 362-385; Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*[2], 1914, Vol. II, p. 308-310; E. Hennecke *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*, 2nd ed., Tübingen 1924, p. 585-587; Connolly, op. cit., p. lxxxvii-xci.

[26] In polemic argument against the Jews the Didascalia maintains (p. 238) that the Romans also hold to the Law but reject the Second Legislation. For that reason their dominion is validated. That betokens a sympathetically neutral stance towards the State, written at a time when martyrdom was still a live issue, but when there was no systematic

persecution of the Church, an attitude which we find elsewhere in the third century. (Notice incidentally the polemic direction of this work). See C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World*, Edinburgh 1925, p. 373-387, 541-545 for an extensive discussion of the changing "Christian Attitude to the State". The attitude displayed here in the Didascalia is particularly striking when one compares it with the strongly modified version in which this material appears in the *Apostolic Constitutions* VI 24, 1. ed. Funk, I, p. 365:

> οὐ μόνον δὲ τὸν τῆς δικαιοσύνης νόμον δι' ἡμῶν ἐπιδείκνυσθαι βούλεται, ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ Ῥωμαίων εὐδόκησεν αὐτὸν φαίνεσθαι καὶ λάμπειν. καὶ γὰρ καὶ οὗτοι πιστεύσαντες ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον καὶ πολυθεΐας ἀπέστησαν καὶ ἀδικίας, καὶ τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς ἀποδέχονται καὶ τοὺς φαύλους κολάζουσιν (post-Constantinian!).

[27] Harnack considered this to be a possibility, though he himself reckoned Arabia (Bostra) more likely: See *Mission* .. Vol. II, p. 671, n. 4-672 and p. 703-705.

[28] Connolly, p. 216-259; cf. also his analysis, p. xxxiv-xxxvi.

[29] Thus in Syriac. The Latin reads: *qui autem convertentur de populo ut credant* etc.; *A.C.* VI 19:1 (Funk, p. 347) also has the 2nd person plural but with a different back-reference: δι' ὧν καὶ παρακαλοῦμεν ὑμᾶς ἐν κυρίῳ ἀπέχεσθαι κτλ.

[30] βαπτίσματα; the same word as that which is used for Baptism but in the plural: to follow the argument as it develops it is important to keep this usage in mind. *A.C.* adds: 'daily'.

[31] *A.C.* adds 'to assist the law of nature'.

[32] A notable example is to be found in Barnabas 9:8.

[33] Cf. Barnabas 2:4 and the comments of Windisch ad loc. I mention this, because Connolly's footnote on p. 221 only refers to Irenaeus; that could give a false impression.

[34] The contents of this Second Legislation are thus described (Connolly, p. 222): "Wherefore he laid upon them continual burnt offerings with a necessity, and caused them to abstain from meats by means of distinctions of meats. For from that time were animals discerned, and clean and unclean flesh; from that time were separations, and purifications, and baptisms, and sprinklings; from that time were sacrifices, and offerings, and tables; from that time were burnt offerings, and oblations, and shewbread, and the offering up of sacrifices, and firstlings, and redemptions, and he-goats for sin, and vows, and many other things marvellous". Compare this with the start of this chapter and footnote 50, below.

[35] There is clearly an allusion here to the so-called Renuntiatio Diaboli in Baptismal rites—cf. W. Smith—S. Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, London 1875, Vol. I, p. 160 and J. Quasten, *Monumenta eucharistica et liturgica vetustissima*, Bonn 1935-1937, p. 115 n. 1-p. 116.

[36] Notice how *A.C.* VI 22:5 asserts the exact opposite, that Jesus himself also submitted to the Deuterosis, but in order to bring it to fulfilment; the ultimate outcome, therefore, is the same.

[37] Drawing on Psalm 2:3 he explains that the 'yoke' refers to the Law whereas the 'bonds' refer to the Second Legislation. "For the Law is a yoke, because like the plough-yoke of oxen it is laid upon the former People and upon the present Church of God: even as now in the church it is upon us who are called from the People and upon you who from among the Gentiles have obtained mercy" (Connolly, p. 228).

[38] See H. Windisch, *Barnabasbrief*, p. 385-386 on such chronological calculations; this typology recurs frequently.

[39] *A.C.* VI 27:1 (Funk 1, p. 369) ἐθικὰ ἰουδαϊκά, γονορροίας, ὀνειρώξεις, πλησιασμοὺς τοὺς κατὰ νόμον.

[40] I am here following *A.C.* VI 27:1: παρατηροῦνται προσεύξασθαι ἢ εὐχαριστίας μεταλαβεῖν ἢ βιβλίου θιγεῖν; thus also the Latin. The Syriac has 'reading the Scriptures'. Defilement, however, is usually incurred by contact.

[41] *A.C.*: τοῦ ἁγίου πνεύματος κενοὶ τυγχάνουσιν τοῦ ἀεὶ παραμένοντος τοῖς πιστοῖς. I am following the Syriac-Latin versions as *A.C.* has once again introduced changes in the text.—This is not the place to discuss the relationship between Baptism and the Holy Spirit. Early Christian teaching tends to see this gift through 'the laying on of hands'

rather than by the fact of baptism in water itself—cf. F. Cabrol 'Imposition des Mains' in: Cabrol-Leclercq, *Dictionnaire*, vol. VII 1, col. 401-403. Baptism and the laying on of hands were closely connected. As the author here deals with one or more 'baptisms', it is understandable that he does not emphasise particularly the means, i.e. the laying on of hands (mentioned also p. 93 and 146), by which the Spirit is given. See also Paul, 1 Cor. 3:16[b].

[42] cf. Connolly, p. 252: "both in your congregations and in your cemeteries", with Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VII 11:10 which mentions the prohibition in AD 257 in Egypt addressed to Dionysius: οὐδαμῶς δὲ ἐξέσται οὔτε ὑμῖν οὔτε ἄλλοις τισὶν ἢ συνόδους ποιεῖσθαι, ἢ εἰς τὰ καλούμενα κοιμητήρια εἰσιέναι. See also J. Bingham, *Origines Ecclesiasticae or Antiquities of the Christian Church*, VIII 1:7-9.

[43] Connolly, p. 4; see also p. 224. Here and elsewhere I intend to point out doublets, because they are a characteristic of this work and because publishers and translators fail on the whole to mention parallel passages within this book.

[44] Connolly, p. 11-14.

[45] See Connolly, p. 218, 224, 230.

[46] Connolly, p. 34-35.

[47] cf. Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis*, VI 15:125—κανὼν δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἡ συνῳδία καὶ συμφωνία νόμου τε καὶ προφητῶν τῇ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν παραδιδομένῃ διαθήκῃ. (N.B. παρουσία here not used in the eschatological sense of the second coming but of the first coming of our Lord as in Ignatius, *Philad.* 9:2—see als the footnote ad loc. in J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers, Part II, St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp*, 1889, vol. II², p. 275-276).

[48] cf. p. 230-233, p. 250.

[49] Connolly, p. 98.

[50] Sc. sacrifices and oblations, sin offerings, purifications, vows, gifts, holocausts, burnt offerings, Sabbath observances, shewbread, tithes, first fruits.

[51] Connolly, p. 86; cf. also about the Ten Commandments p. 218.

[52] Connolly, p. 204.

[53] Extended treatment of this in chapter 20. Clearly there was a pressing need for this also; notice the connection with martyrdom (p. 176).

[54] Connolly, p. 198-199.

[55] Connolly, p. 4.

[56] Connolly, p. 191.

[57] cf. E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*⁴, Leipzig 1907, Vol. II, p. 551-558. In *A.C.* V 20 this passage is totally altered.

[58] cf. Connolly, p. 239 note; Windisch, op. cit., p. 383 on Barn. 15:7.

[59] cf. with this passage Barnabas 8 with Windisch's commentary. It is interesting that in their treatment of this theme, which is not found in any other writer in the early centuries, Barnabas and Didascalia take quite different approaches: Barn. opts for allegorisation; *Didasc.* takes it literally and abolishes it!

[60] J. L. Koole, *De overname van het Oude Testament door de Christelijke Kerk*, Hilversum 1938, dissertation for the Vrije Universiteit. In this book all the patristic material up to and incl. Irenaeus is brought together. One criticism I have, however, is that Koole's way of setting out his material makes it difficult to gain a summary view. There is for instance no coherent presentation of the view held by someone like Justin Martyr; the only way to gain this is by patient quarrying in this detailed study. I mention this in view of my own quotations in the following pages. I found it impossible to refer readers to Koole's book because I am concerned with exactly such coherent views.

[61] cf. 1 Clement 4:12; Connolly, p. 194-197.

[62] Connolly, p. 53.

[63] Connolly, p. 80.

[64] Connolly, p. 86.

[65] 1 Clement 40; Cyprian, *Epistula* I 1.

[66] Connolly, p. 32.

[67] Connolly, p. 218, citing Mt. 8:4. Notice here the addition in *A.C.* VI 22:1 (Funk 1, p. 355), which clearly brings out the divergent standpoints: Χριστὸς γὰρ παραγενόμενος .... τὸν

νόμον κυρώσας ἐπλήρωσεν, τὰ ἐπείσακτα περιεῖλεν, εἰ καὶ μὴ πάντα, ἀλλά γε τὰ βαρύτερα, τὸν μὲν βεβαιώσας, τὰ δὲ παύσας.

[68] cf. Achelis, op. cit., p. 360.

[69] Connolly, p. 6, 144-145 & 250.

[70] 1 Peter 2:9 is quoted just before this.

[71] Tertullian, *De Oratione*, 28; see also J. Bingham, *Antiquities*, XIII 1,5.

[72] G. F. Moore, *Judaism in the First Centuries of the Christian Era*, Cambridge, Mass. 1932, vol. II, p. 15.

[73] One misses for instance in the Didascalia the well-known quotation from Mal. 1:11-14 much favoured from *Didache* 14:3 onwards as a description of the Lord's Supper in sacrificial terms; cf. R. Knopf, *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel, Die zwei Clemensbriefe*, Tübingen 1920, p. 36, ad loc.

[74] Connolly, p. l-li.

[75] Connolly, p. xxxiv, lix, lxii and lxviii.

[76] Achelis, op. cit., p. 360.

[77] Achelis, op. cit., p. 357.

[78] E. Hennecke, op. cit., p. 586.

[79] As for instance the Ethiopic Didascalia, ed. Harden, p. 7 in a place which corresponds to Connolly, p. 14.

[80] Connolly, p. lvii-lix, gives instances of the various uses of the word.

[81] This is unnecessary; see Koole, op. cit. and literature referred to. Koole fails to mention: A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch*, Vol. 1, S. 620-628, and 'Geschichte eines programmatischen Wortes Jesu (Mt. 5:17) in der ältesten Kirche', in: *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1912, p. 184-207. Connolly's treatment, p. lixff., is very brief and quite inadequate.

[82] P. G. Kunst, *Joodsche Invloeden bij Paulus*, Amsterdam 1937, *passim*.

[83] The excursus by H. Windisch, op. cit., p. 393ff, is of considerable importance here.

[84] See chap. 9 and Lightfoot, op. cit., p. 124 and 128-129.

[85] I fail to understand how Harnack could argue: "Justin, der Apologet, sah sich dazu [vor dem Forum der Griechen Rechenschaft von seinem Glauben abzulegen] genötigt; er musste rund und deutlich zum Ausdruck bringen, wie die Christenheit zum alttestamentlichen Gesetze steht". (*S.B.A.*, 1912, p. 197). I can see no reason whatsoever to doubt that this Dialogue was genuinely born out of polemic against the Jews and that it has nothing to do with the defence of the faith against the Greeks.

[86] *Dialogue with Trypho*, 30.

[87] Harnack, *S.B.A.*, 1912, p. 198-199: he presupposes here *inter alia* influence of Stoic ideas on the rest that is upheld by Justin. I very much doubt it.

[88] O. Bardenhewer, op. cit., vol. I, p. 207.

[89] Connolly, p. 234-236.

[90] O. Bardenhewer, op. cit., p. 407.

[91] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haereses*, IV 15:1.

[92] Irenaeus, *Epideixis*, 84, with texts which appear similarly in the Didascalia.

[93] Connolly, p. lxiv.

[94] J. Rendel Harris, *Testimonies*, 2 vols., Cambridge 1916-1920; cf. vol. II, p. 101-108, on questions of ritual, circumcision, sacrifices, Sabbath, though he does not mention the writers who interest us in this study.

[95] Clement of Alexandria, *Paedagogus*, I 11. I believe it would be worth collecting the parallels between Clement and the Didascalia: I suspect their "common property" would be not inconsiderable.

[96] On Clement's approach to the Law see Bigg, *Christian Platonists*, p. 84-85. Bigg makes some further points about the general interpretation of the Law in that period in an important footnote on p. 82, note 2-p. 83. On Origen's view of the Law see Bigg, p. 251-252: this is strongly allegorical. In the Old Testament cult Origen found the Christian hierarchy, p. 259.

[97] Clement of Alex., *Stromateis*, I 28.

[98] Fanciful ideas such as I = 10, the name of Jesus at the head of the Decalogue, are no doubt from the mind of the author; they serve to strengthen but not to alter the basic approach.

[99] Connolly, p. lxv-lxvi "his unfriendly attitude to the Deuterosis may be due in part to an unconscious bias derived from other influences" with a reference to this letter.—F.C. Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis*, Cambridge 1932, p. 26: "A modification of this theory [of Ptolemaeus] is to be found in an early Christian, non-Gnostic work, called the Didascalia. Possibly the Didascalia is independent altogether of Ptolemaeus, but both systems recognise a temporary element in the Law, an element which is not obligatory for Christians either to obey or to defend". Harnack also, *S.B.A.*, 1912, p. 195, reckoned that the mainstream Church effectively reached the same conclusion as Ptolemaeus but after him.

[100] Preserved in Epiphanius, *Panarion*, XXXIII 3-7, ed. K. Holl, *Epiphanius' Werke*, Vol. I, Leipzig 1915, p. 450ff.; cf. A. Harnack, 'Der Brief des Ptolemaeus an die Flora, eine religiöse Kritik am Pentateuch im zweiten Jahrhundert', in: *S.B.A.*, 1902, p. 507-541.

[101] The contrary evidence (see Connolly, p. lvii-lviii), some similarly sounding words and one passage which *might* just be conceived as a reaction to Ptolemaeus, is totally insufficient.

[102] As, for instance, by those who seek to use this little piece to show that the Gnostics were not as misguided as they were made out to be by the Church Fathers and consequently that the account of them given by Irenaeus and his like is a tendentious distortion of the truth—e.g. E. Preuschen, 'Valentinus, Gnostiker', in: J. Herzog—A. Hauck, *Realencyclopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*[3], Leipzig 1908, vol. XX, p. 406.

[103] Achelis, op. cit., p. 357ff.

[104] C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, Leipzig 1919, p. 387.

[105] Connolly, p. lxxxix.

[106] J. Thomas, *Le mouvement baptiste en Palestine et Syrie*, Gembloux 1935, p. 406-407.

[107] Collected in F. X. Funk, *Didascalia*, vol. II, p. 3-14.

[108] See W. Brandt, *Die jüdischen Baptismen oder das religiöse Waschen und Baden im Judentum mit Einschluss des Judenchristentums*, Giessen 1910, and Thomas, op. cit., *passim*.

[109] A. Harnack, *Lehrbuch*, vol. I, p. 310-311.

[110] Connolly, p. 202.

[111] Connolly, p. 204.

[112] The description of the heretics on p. 240-242 matches almost word for word that on p. 202. Connolly rightly brands this as "largely artificial" (p. xxxv).

[113] Connolly, p. 242-244.

[114] Connolly, p. 228.

[115] This is the standard form when they are directly addressed, Connolly, p. 216, 233.

[116] Achelis, op. cit., p. 355ff.

[117] Connolly, p. 191.

[118] Connolly, p. 192.

[119] *A.C.*, V 20:19 (Funk I, p. 301).

[120] Connolly, p. 124 compared with *A.C.*, II 59:3 (Funk I, p. 171-173); see also the Index in Funk s.v.

[121] See the relevant part of chapter 26.

[122] W. Smith-A. Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, vol. II, p. 1822-1826, s.v. 'Sabbath', provides a detailed discussion of the place of the Sabbath in the Christian Church.

[123] Connolly, p. 242, referred to Clem. *Hom.* VII 8, ed. Dressel, p. 179.

[124] Hauler, p. 119, referred to by Connolly, p. lxxxix.

[125] Dionysius of Alexandria, *Epistula Canonica ad Basilidem*, can. 2, in: Migne, *Patrologia Graeca*, vol. X, col. 1281; note that he too refers to Mt. 9:20, but says that the woman did not dare to touch Jesus himself but only the hem of his garment.

[126] Texts in my dissertation: *Nestorian Questions on the Eucharist*, Haarlem 1937, p. 133 incl. note 2 and p. 218—That sexual intercourse makes unclean and unfit for divine service is the idea behind the attempt at Nicaea to introduce the prohibition for priests,

which failed because of the opposition of the ascetic (NB) Paphnutius: see Socrates, *Hist. Eccl.* I 11.

[127] cf. J. Thomas, op. cit.

[128] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromateis* III 12.

[129] See E. A. Sophocles, *Greek Lexicon of the Roman and Byzantine Periods*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1914, s.v. ἰουδαΐζω.

[130] Ignatius, *Philad.* 6:1.

NOTES ON THE NATURE OF CLEMENS ALEXANDRINUS' *CANON ECCLESIASTICUS*

The study of early Christian literature is often rather like a walk among ruins; here and there one may chance upon complete and undamaged pieces, whilst elsewhere scanty remains bear witness to a bygone glory. So one may find a few words or sentences which kindle the interest of the researcher, puzzling traces of something which was once significant but in later days not considered worth the effort of copying. It is precisely because they are echoes of a forgotten period that they capture our attention! Might it not be possible to discover more than appears at first sight by combining these with other data and thus to lift yet one more corner of the veil that covers the earliest history of Christianity?

In this article I want to try to shed some light on a work of the great Alexandrian catechist, Clement, with the title 'Canon Ecclesiasticus sive adversus Judaizantes'. Here also we have little more to go by than the title, but that is of such interest that one cannot avoid the challenge to search for an explanation of it. Both the slender volume of the material and the fact that few attempts have been made by leading scholars to find a clue to the meaning of these puzzling words make it possible to gain a complete survey of everything relevant. This is not only possible but also necessary, as we cannot afford to lose track of any clue, however small.

I

Among the many reports from Christian antiquity preserved by Eusebius in his *History of the Church* there is a list of the writings of Clement of Alexandria (*c.* AD 150-210). Here one may find the title of a work described as follows: "ὁ ἐπιγεγραμμένος Κανὼν Ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἢ πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαΐζοντας, ὃν Ἀλεξάνδρῳ τῷ δεδηλωμένῳ ἐπισκόπῳ ἀνατέθεικεν"[1].

It belongs to that category of writings, which have disappeared almost without trace. As far as is known, even after the painstaking research of O. Stählin[2], not a single manuscript has preserved it either in full or even in part. Only one very small fragment has been discovered to date in a polemical treatise by Nicephorus of Constantinople (d. AD 828)[3]. He wrote three Antirrhetica, in which he defended the worship of images and sought to give it a christological foundation. He was well versed in patristics and his disputations furnish us with several important quotations from early Christian literature; these were adduced by him as the

arguments from the Tradition. These Testimonia Patrum have been omitted in Migne's edition (vol. 100, col. 534) but they have been published by Pitra[4]. The quotation from Clement appears in Part I, which offers 'Testimonia de Circumscripto Domini Corpore sive de vera Christi Incarnatione'. Here the quotation from our work is introduced with the following words: "ἐκ τοῦ κατὰ τοὺς 'Ιουδαΐζοντας".

This Fragment has been printed several times since it was first published by le Nourry in 1694; the latest reprint appears in Stählin's edition (III, p. 218-219). To date it has proved impossible to find any further passages.

Is it then feasible to deduce the nature of the whole work from the lines preserved for us? The passage is neither great in length (20 lines) nor particularly striking. At first glance it appears to be an ordinary piece of the sort of allegory so often displayed by Clement. He points out that Solomon in saying: "But can God indeed dwell on earth?" (I Kings 8:27a) not only alluded to the spiritual (πνευματικός), heavenly Temple but also meant the flesh, which the Son and Lord of David would build up for his dwelling here on earth and for the church, which would come into being through the unity of belief:

"κατοικεῖ δὲ ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς, σάρκα περιβαλλόμενος, καὶ μετὰ ἀνθρώπων αὐτῷ κατοίκησις γίνεται ἐν τῇ κατὰ τοὺς δικαίους συνθέσει τε καὶ ἁρμονίᾳ, νεὼν ἅγιον ἐργαζομένῳ τε καὶ ἀναστάντι".

He strengthens this assertion by appealing to 1 Pet. 2:5 (the church = the Temple) and John 2:19-21 (Christ's body = the Temple).

If we now have a closer look at this fragment, we notice that Clement is in this instance not offering the sort of 'spiritual' interpretation so often found in his writings. It is true that he alludes to it in the beginning: the OT Temple has a heavenly meaning, Clement knows that but he asserts more; he applies this OT text to Christ and his coming in the flesh and to the concrete reality of the church.

It is not immediately clear how this squares with the title: ecclesiastical canon. For the moment, however, we will leave this question on one side and simply signal here this difference in application; this needs to be steadily kept in view, as I believe it to be of considerable significance for the task of determining the nature of the book as a whole.

But is this task even remotely possible without further discoveries which might shed light on our text? Several scholars, including Zahn and von Harnack, have made the attempt but without arriving at an agreed conclusion. In these attempts, however, one passage was overlooked which is of decisive importance for a proper exegesis. I intend to return to it after we have first examined the views of the earlier church about this book and the attempts of a later period to explain the title.

II

Was there more known about our treatise in earlier centuries, around the time of Eusebius or after him, than is available to us now? This question brings us to a study of the *Testimonia Veterum*[5]. These seem all either directly or indirectly to depend on Eusebius.

a) In the Latin translation of Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History by Rufinus, the words of VI 13:3 are translated as follows (ed. Mommsen, II, p. 547): "et ille, qui superscribitur 'Canon Ecclesiasticus' item alius de his, qui Iudaicum sensum in scripturis sequuntur, quem ad Alexandrum supra dictum episcopum scribit." Here as elsewhere[6] Rufinus has provided more of an interpretation than a translation. He has turned the one original book with its double title (a not uncommon phenomenon) into two works with different contents ("alius"!). Furthermore Ἰουδαΐζω is here explained as Judaistic exposition of the Holy Scriptures mistakenly followed by Christians, i.e. error in the field of exegesis.

b) It is clear from the fact, that the title of Clement's treatise is rendered quite differently by Jerome, that its Latin translation had no fixed form. It is well known that Jerome tends to follow Eusebius' data very closely in his *De Viris Inlustribus*[7]. A deviation is, therefore, all the more significant. In *De Viris Inlustribus* 38 (ed. C. A. Bernouilli, p. 27) he writes: "de canonibus ecclesiasticis et adversum eos, qui Iudaeorum sequuntur errorem, liber unus, quem proprie Alexandro Hierosolymorum episcopo προσεφώνησεν".

Here the work under discussion is treated as one book, but the one ecclesiastical canon has become plural, and instead of "or" indicating an alternative we have "and"[8] suggesting that different themes are treated. Ἰουδαΐζω does not in this case refer directly to Scriptural exegesis but is used in the more general sense of "straying into Jewish errors", without mentioning the area of concern. Th. Zahn was surely right in his judgment, that Jerome "das Buch schwerlich gesehen hat"[9].

c) When we come to the IXth century Byzantine scholar, Photius (*Bibliotheca* Cod. 111, ed. I. Bekker, p. 89-90), we notice that his terminology shows a marked divergence from that of Eusebius, while at the same time closely agreeing with the Greek translation of *De Viris Inlustribus*—"περὶ κανόνων ἐκκλησιαστικῶν κατὰ τῶν ἀκολουθούντων τῇ τῶν Ἰουδαίων πλάνῃ"—as Zahn had already demonstrated. We must conclude that this prince of the Church does not provide an independent witness but that there is proof here that this investigator had not seen the work himself.

d) The way in which Nicephorus quotes the fragment preserved for us does not allow us to judge with any certainty whether he had seen the

treatise himself or whether he is drawing on the kind of anthology of quotations or florilegium used so often by the Byzantines. It is, therefore, impossible to say whether the work was still intact in his day or whether it had been lost.

The conclusion to be drawn from our survey is that it tells us nothing of essential importance about this lost book. Those who follow Eusebius have no independent knowledge of it, so that we must assume that it disappeared at a fairly early date. For in the East there is no trace of it to be found in the six centuries between Clement and Nicephorus and in the West there is no personal acquaintance with it. The various translations offered of the title show that it was no longer intelligible and that these were attempts to force some sense into baffling words. But the fact that it was at such an early stage already impossible to understand its literal meaning makes it all the more advisable for us to stick to the text delivered by Eusebius. How, then, are *we* to explain the title?

III

In the absence of evidence to the contrary we must assume, that Clement briefly and adequately described the content of his book with the title: "Κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἢ πρὸς τοὺς 'Ιουδαΐζοντας". In addition, whatever the meaning we give to the title, it must fit the character of the extant fragment. It is of course possible to argue that either Nicephorus or one of his predecessors has torn this fragment out of its context, but that cannot be more than an unsubstantiated assertion. It is axiomatic in a properly scientific approach that one should first seek an unforced explanation of *all* the known facts and should only take refuge in arguments like the above, if such an explanation cannot be found.

Can we learn anything from the dedication to Alexander of Jerusalem? What we know of this bishop's life[10] gives no obvious point of connection, though it is a priori likely that he would have had dealings with "Judaizantes" (I am deliberately leaving the term unexplained at this stage) in Palestine. But we cannot be certain of this.

No alternative, therefore, remains open to us other than to take the terms of the title one by one, in order to see what translations might be deemed possible.

a. What does "canon (ecclesiasticus)" mean[11]? The rule of that which is normative in the Church in matters of faith and conduct; its use in connection with Holy Scripture, which is that most familiar to us, appears somewhat later, as does its reference to a "synodical decision" (with this last meaning it sometimes appears in the plural, but that is still unknown in the third century; Jerome seems to have taken it this way). After men-

tioning that Clement had written a book with this title Beyer[11] writes as follows: "Dieser kirchliche Kanon umschliesst sowohl das als regula veritatis gefasste Taufbekenntnis Iren. I 9.4, als auch die geltende Kirchenlehre in ihrem ganzen Umfang Cl. Al. *Strom.* VII 15,90,2, als auch den richtigen Vollzug der kirchlichen Handlungen. Für das 3. Jhdt. ist also die Glaubensregel der Kanon der Kirche, lange ehe die hl. Schrift mit diesem Worte bezeichnet wurde. Natürlich galt der Inhalt der Regel als biblisch" (605), adding a reference to a passage in Clement to which I will return.

Dr. den Boer brings the meaning very close to the "Canon of the Holy Scriptures" (although this is still an open issue in Clement), but nevertheless he also translates it as "Church rule". He points out that the unity of the Old and New Testament takes first place and that the OT has to be explained in the light of the New Testament (p. 37).

However, if we attempt to get a clear picture of this work in the light of this information, we seem still to be groping. For what is the special connection with "Judaizantes"? After all the canon of the church as the regula fidei is aimed at *every* heresy. What is more, how does this fit the known fragment?

In any event, we now have a glimpse of some possibilities.

b. What is the meaning of ἰουδαΐζω[12]? We have already noticed that the Latin translators did not know what exactly this meant; anyway, each gives it a meaning according to his own opinion. The verb means "going over to Judaism", or "observing Jewish views and customs". Both meanings pre-date Christianity. Patristic writers tend to use it in the latter sense.

How can we link this up with the fragment and with the 'canon' of the title in a coherent way? Or do we have to be content with vague indications of all sorts of heresies without any sharper definition? Yet Clement clearly speaks of τοὺς ἰουδαΐζοντας, i.e. an obviously identifiable group. We are bound to set that against Bardenhewer's view, that "weder aus diesem Fragmente noch aus dem Titel der Schrift lässt sich erkennen, welche judaisierende Richtung Klemens zum Kampfe herausgefordert hat"[13], because this conjures up the impression of a number of such groups. Moreover, our scanty knowledge of the history of the Eastern churches in the first centuries makes it very uncertain, whether a particular party is meant here; judaizare might well have been a widespread and general tendency.

While some[14] have merely mentioned the title without trying to give a more precise characterisation of its contents, the attempt has been made by Zahn, Kattenbusch, and Harnack.

1. Theodor Zahn was the first, with his *Supplementum Clementinum*, to bring order into the jumble of Clementine fragments, which had come to light during the course of centuries and to distinguish the genuine from the false[15]. He too reckons it impossible to be sure "gegen welche für judaisirend geltende Richtung Clemens in diesem Buch den 'kirchlichen Kanon', d.h. den Inbegriff des katholischen Glaubens und der katholischen Lebensordnung vertreten hat". His view is that it was aimed at the Quartodecimans, heretics, who observed the 14th Nisan as the day of the crucifixion and were sometimes characterised as judaisers by their opponents[16]. He dismisses as worthless le Nourry's theory that another lost work by Clement on the Passover was written against this heresy, but as he failed to substantiate this any further it is better not to accept such an apodictic statement at its face value.

But Zahn's own theory does not do justice to the obvious exegetical thrust of the fragment, is pure guesswork conjured up out of thin air, and should only be considered if nothing better appears. Despite the many undoubtedly useful contributions made by Zahn not least in the study of Clement, this must be our verdict.

2. A different conclusion was reached by F. Kattenbusch in his discussion of Origen's exegetical method. The latter calls allegorical exegesis the "expositio ecclesiastica" (*in Num. Hom.* XXVI 2, ed. Baehrens, p. 246), which he elsewhere (*Selecta in Exod.*, XX 5, ed. Delarue II, p. 125) contrasts with the Jewish, fleshly view and with heretical distortion. This Jewish view was also current among Christians (*in Lev. Hom.* X 1, ed. Baehrens, p. 440). After these quotations he continues: "Es ist mir angesichts dessen die Idee gekommen, dass wohl auch der rätselhafte Titel des Werkes des Clemens.... von hier aus zu deuten ist. Der 'kirchliche Kanon', die Schriften, verlangen pneumatische Exegese: vielleicht ist dies das Thema des Cl. gewesen"[17]. In effect he is taking the line implied in Rufinus' translation, though he does not mention him. In this view the exegetical element is correctly brought to the fore and seen in isolation that cannot be objected to. But we have already noticed in our study of the fragment that we need to observe some distinctions in the use of allegory. It is not necessary to pursue this point, though I must point out that the concept of "allegory" in the hermeneutical method of Clement is exceedingly difficult to handle[18]. It should also be noted that the word is often used in slovenly fashion, sometimes to cover anything other than the literal meaning, sometimes certain forms of non-grammatical exegesis. Moreover, Kattenbusch uses the word "Canon" here in a sense never found in Clement. This theory also, although it contains some useful points, must therefore be considered inadequate.

3. It is extraordinary that the otherwise virtually complete, detailed work of Bardenhewer does mention these two theories, but fails to reproduce Harnack's opinion. He also maintains that it cannot be decided against whom precisely Clement is writing, but that the definition of κανὼν ἐκκλησιαστικός provided by Clement himself in *Stromateis* VI 15:125 indicates that his opponents were "solche Christen..., welche die allegorische Auslegung des A.T. im Princip oder theilweise beanstandeten"; he thinks these may have been Marcionites or Chiliasts, who flourished in Egypt (Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* VII 24) but does not exclude the Quartodecimans, though he considers that unlikely; it could also refer to Jewish Christians[19].

Here we have suggestions in plenty, but Harnack himself made no choice. This could be thought wise, as his theory is thus so vague, that it cannot be criticised; on the other hand this simply leaves us in a fog. The real value of his remarks is that Harnack seems to me to have opened up a path towards a solution, though he himself did not pursue it. In addition to this we have also seen from our discussion of 1. and 2. which directions to avoid.

IV

If we now turn to Clement's own words, we shall begin with the passage quite rightly cited by Harnack and also mentioned by Beyer, though they failed to set it in its true perspective. In *Strom.* VI 15:125 Clement gives his definition. It is preceded by 124, an attack on the real liars, who rob our Lord of His due honour by false interpretations of Scripture. For the divine mysteries were neither in prophecy nor by our Saviour made clear and easily understandable for casual hearers, but were given in parables[20] (see Mt. 13:34). As all things have come into being through the Saviour (John 1:3), so also Prophecy and Law (i.e. OT) were spoken by Him and in parables. But all is straightforward to those who understand (Prov. 8:9), i.e. to those who accept and keep κατὰ τὸν ἐκκλησιαστικὸν κανόνα the interpretation of Holy Scripture that was revealed by Him. What then is this canon? Κανὼν δὲ ἐκκλησιαστικὸς ἡ συνῳδία καὶ συμφωνία νόμου τε καὶ προφητῶν τῇ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου παρουσίαν[21] παραδιδομένῃ διαθήκῃ[22]. That is to say that the canon of the church consists herein, in the unity of OT prophecy and fulfilment in Jesus Christ, so that everything in the OT refers to the incarnate Son and His work; thus no wedge must be driven between the two Testaments nor must the promises of the OT and matters mentioned in it be interpreted apart from Christ. In short, we do better to speak here of *the typological meaning of the OT*, in contradistinction from allegory. If we now look again

at Clement's lost work in the light of this interpretation of the "canon" then we can see that it makes excellent sense in the preserved fragment, for the connection between the OT and the NT is also set out in it: the Temple of Solomon = the Body of Christ = the Church of the New Covenant.

A passage which has to date not been used in this discussion but clearly throws a lot of light on all this proves that we are not following a false trail. It is to be found in the so-called *Didascalia Apostolorum*[23]. This treatise originated in the course of the IIIrd century, probably in Northern Palestine. The original Greek text no longer exists but it has been partly preserved in the *Apostolic Constitutions*, though in a rewritten form with some additions; apart from that we only possess a Syriac and a Latin translation of it.

In chapter IV, which is concerned with the duties of a bishop, we read the following[24]:

and let him be assiduous in his teaching, and constant in reading the divine Scriptures with diligence, that he may interpret and expound the Scriptures fittingly. And let him compare the Law and the Prophets with the Gospel, so that the sayings of the Law and the Prophets may be in accord with the Gospel.

ἔστω δὲ ἀνεξίκακος, μακρόθυμος ἐν ταῖς νουθεσίαις, πολυδιδακτικός, μελετῶν καὶ σπουδάζων ἐν ταῖς κυριακαῖς βίβλοις, πολὺς ἐν ἀναγνώσμασιν, ἵνα τὰς γραφὰς ἐπιμελῶς ἑρμηνεύῃ, ὁμοστοίχως τοῖς Προφήταις καὶ τῷ Νόμῳ τὸ Εὐαγγέλιον ἑρμηνεύων· ὁμοίως τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ στοιχείτωσαν αἱ ἐκ Νόμου καὶ Προφητῶν ἑρμηνεῖαι.

Even though the words used are different, we see that the last clause provides a striking parallel to the definition of "Canon" by Clement, and that this Canon is part of the task of a bishop.

How are we to understand "The Law and the Prophets"? Does this refer only to the Mosaic books and the writings of the Prophets (Isaiah-Malachi)? This is not really likely. The expression appears a number of times in the NT and is there used to indicate the whole of the OT Canon[25]; although, of course, the adaptation of the so often quoted Book of Proverbs was easier and more direct than that of law prescriptions and prophecy. The expression most likely has here the same meaning as in the New Testament as appears from the wording of the Didascalia[26].

There are plenty of examples to be found in the Didascalia of such an application of the "Canon", for instance on p. 6 where a quotation from Numbers 24:9 is followed by "and in the Gospel also it is written again" after which Luke 6:28 is cited; on p. 98 the liberation from the bonds of the "second legislation" is discussed[27], quotations from Is. 49:9 and 42:7 and from Psalm 69:34 ("in David he said") are followed by "and likewise in the Gospel He said" which leads into Mt. 11:28-29, one of

our author's favourite texts. It should not surprise us that the Didascalia, unlike the Clementine Fragment, does not provide a christological typology; it is a treatise concerned with the church's life rather than with its teaching. We do find texts from Ezekiel about shepherds applied directly to bishops. It is self-evident to our author that the Old and the New Testaments speak with one voice as both have their origin in one and the same God (Christ). This is not quite so obvious to everyone, cf. Paul 2 Cor. 3:13ff.

From other passages in this fascinating Didascalia, it would appear that it was written to counter those who were trying to introduce Jewish practices such as Sabbath observance and ritual washings on the basis of the requirements of the OT Law. Such people did not relate any of these to the work of Christ, who had come precisely to remove the burden of the Law; instead they accorded to the Law an independent authority for the Christian. The author(s) passionately denounced this approach. Here also those under fire were not, as Connolly has already observed, Jewish Christians but judaizing Christians. Chapter xxvi of the Didascalia provides us with a practical demonstration 1) of the purport of such judaizing practices, and 2) how the counterattack was rooted in the concept of "Harmony" between the Old and the New Testament.

In this connection I would like to point out that the doctrine so characteristic of the Didascalia, that of a "Second Legislation" introduced as punishment for the idolatrous worship of the Golden Calf (Exod. 32), is alluded to by Clement, although he himself neither uses this construction in his own writings or against his opponents nor actually mentions Δευτέρωσις as such[28].

It is of the utmost significance to observe the way in which these data from the Didascalia link up with our information about Clement's work.

Clement	*Didascalia*
1. Canon Ecclesiasticus = typological correspondence between OT and NT	1. Harmony between OT and NT
2. Against judaizers	2. Against judaizers
3. Addressed to the bishop	3. Task of a bishop
4. of Jerusalem	4. Origin in Palestine

Seen in this light all the data we have about this work by Clement fit into a coherent pattern and can be interpreted along one clear line.

We can therefore in conclusion sketch the character of this treatise as follows: it dealt with the typological application of the Old Testament to Christ and the Church; this was in the nature of a defence against people who denied any such connection, who were deemed to read the OT according to the flesh in that they accorded to the Law and the Prophets

an independent meaning and authority in the life of the church. The bishop of Jerusalem was particularly troubled by people with such notions, and the leader of the catechetical School in Alexandria duly came to his aid. The lines along which he did this can to a certain extent be deduced from the Fragment preserved for us.

This similarity with the data from the Didascalia also offers a possible explanation of the early disappearance of the "Canon Ecclesiasticus". The history of the Didascalia demonstrates how ideas changed with the passing of time so that this treatise needed to be "updated", as it was in fact in the version that appears in the Apostolic Constitutions. The significant fact for us is that the part which most sharply attacked the judaizers is precisely that part which was most radically altered (chapter XXVI)[29].

Eusebius almost certainly consulted this book by Clement in the library in Jerusalem which was founded by Alexander and mentioned with gratitude by Eusebius (*Hist. Eccl.* VI 20:1). But the stream of thought had meanwhile been directed against other controversies and it was therefore no longer worth-while to copy words directed against a heresy which had ceased to be a live issue.

Could further traces have been preserved? It is conceivable that other fragments may be recognised now that the characteristics of this work have been outlined.

The size of the work is of course something about which we know nothing, but the subject matter and method have in this essay been shown to be clearly definable. We have thus gained a clear insight into the nature of Clement's lost work and, in the process, judged the various theories propounded about it and found them to be unsubstantiated guesswork.

NOTES

* The original of this article appeared in *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* XXXIII (N.S.) (1942), p. 49-61.

[1] Eusebius, *Historia Ecclesiastica* VI 13:3, ed. E. Schwartz, II, p. 546—For the nature and the transmission of the various writings of Clement of Alexandria see the masterly survey by O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, 2nd ed., Freiburg i. Br. 1914, vol. II, p. 40-95.

[2] O. Stählin, *Klemens Alexandrinus*, 4 vols., Leipzig 1905-1936, (in: *Die griechischen christlichen Schriftsteller der ersten drei Jahrhunderte*).

[3] About him see: E. von Dobschütz, in: Herzog-Hauck, *P.R.E.*, 3rd ed., vol. XVI, Leipzig 1904, p. 22-25.

[4] J. B. Pitra, *Spicilegium Solesmense*, vol. I, Paris 1852, p. 336-370.—The quotation from Clement on p. 351 is here simply introduced with "incipit" and "excipit" with a reference to le Nourry; it is nr. 20 in the series.

[5] Published by Th. Zahn, *Forschungen zur Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons und der altkirchlichen Literatur*, vol. III, *Supplementum Clementinum*, Erlangen 1884, p. 35-36, and O. Stählin in his edition, vol. III, p. liii-liv.

[6] About his style of translation see Mommsen, op. cit., vol. III, p. ccxlix-cclxviii, and Bardenhewer, op. cit., vol. III, p. 555.

[7] cf. Bardenhewer, op. cit., vol. I², p. 1, and B. Altaner, *Patrologie*. Freiburg i. Br. 1938, p. 6.

[8] Similarly a variant reading in the Σ arm. text of Eusebius; see the critical apparatus in Stählin, ad loc.

[9] Th. Zahn, op. cit., p. 35.

[10] See E. Venables in: W. Smith-H. Wace, *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, London 1877, vol. I, p. 85-86, s.v. 'Alexander'.

[11] Cf. F. Cabrol in: F. Cabrol-H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'Archéologie chrétienne et de Liturgie*, Paris 1909, vol. II 2, col. 1847, s.v. *Canon*; also H. W. Beyer in: G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1937, vol. III, p. 600-606, s.v., esp. p. 604-605. For the use of κανών in Clement see also W. den Boer, *De allegorese in het werk van Clemens Alexandrinus*, diss. Leiden 1940, p. 36.

[12] W. Grundmann, in: Kittel, op. cit., vol. III, p. 385, s.v.

[13] Bardenhewer, op. cit., vol. II, p. 79; quite rightly he dismisses the view advanced by E. de Faye, *Clément d'Alexandrie*, Paris 1892, p. 42, that this refers to the Jews.

[14] B. F. Westcott in Smith-Wace, op. cit., vol. I, p. 560; N. Bonwetsch in J. Herzog —A. Hauck, *Realencyclopaedie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd. ed., Leipzig 1898, vol. IV, p. 158; A. Puech, *Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne*, Paris 1928, vol. II, p. 353—he calls the fragment "peu significatif"; B. Altaner, op. cit., p. 117—mentions the title in a list of writings of which "unbedeutende Bruchstücke" are extant. O. Stählin also simply mentions the facts without further comment.

[15] In his edition of the fragments O. Stählin is strongly dependent on Zahn, as indeed he admits in his introduction to vol. III.

[16] Zahn, op. cit., p. 37.—Concerning the Quartodecimans see C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, Leipzig 1919, p. 577-725; Glaue, in: *R.G.G.*, 2nd edn, vol. IV, col. 1667, s.v.

[17] F. Kattenbusch, *Das Apostolische Symbol*, Leipzig 1900, vol. II, p. 175, n.

[18] On this see the excellent dissertation by Dr. den Boer, above n. 11.

[19] Ad. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*, 4th ed., Tübingen 1909, vol. I, p. 314 n. 315.

[20] Ed. O Stählin, vol. II, p. 494: φεῦσται τοίνυν τῷ ὄντι οὐχ οἱ συμπεριφερόμενοι δι' οἰκονομίαν σωτηρίας οὐδ' οἱ περί τινα τῶν ἐν μέρει σφαλλόμενοι, ἀλλ' οἱ εἰς τὰ κυριώτατα παραπίπτοντες καὶ ἀθετοῦντες μὲν τὸν κύριον τὸ ὅσον ἐπ' αὐτοῖς, ἀποστεροῦντες δὲ τοῦ κυρίου τὴν ἀληθῆ διδασκαλίαν, οἱ μὴ κατ' ἀξίαν τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ τοῦ κυρίου τὰς γραφὰς λαλοῦντές τε καὶ παραδιδόντες· παραθήκη γὰρ ἀποδιδομένη θεῷ ἡ κατὰ τὴν τοῦ κυρίου διδασκαλίαν διὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων αὐτοῦ τῆς θεοσεβοῦς παραδόσεως σύνεσίς τε καὶ συνάσκησις.... οὔτε γὰρ ἡ προφητεία οὔτε ὁ σωτὴρ αὐτὸς ἁπλῶς οὕτως, ὡς τοῖς ἐπιτυχοῦσιν εὐάλωτα εἶναι, τὰ θεῖα μυστήρια ἀπεφθέγξατο, ἀλλ' ἐν παραβολαῖς διελέξατο.

[21] παρουσία not in the eschatological sense but used of Jesus' birth—see Lightfoot's comment ad Ignatius, *Philad.* IX:2, *Apostolic Fathers*, vol. II 2, 2nd ed., p. 275-276; *Acta Justini* II 6, ed. Knopf-Krüger, 3rd ed., p. 16; Clement *Fragment* (Stählin, vol III, p. 218, 27-28.)

[22] Ed. O. Stählin, vol. II, p. 494-495.

[23] About the Didascalia see the chapter on 'The Significance of the Mosaic Law for the Christian Church according to the Syriac Didascalia'. The relevant literature is mentioned there (in this volume pp. 7-39).

[24] R. H. Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum, the Syriac Version translated and accompanied by the Verona Latin Fragments*, Oxford 1929, is quoted here in English translation (p. 34); the Greek parallel is quoted from F. X. Funk's edition of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, II 5:4 (p. 37).

[25] Mt. 5:17, 7:12, 11:13, 22:40, Luke 16:16, John 1:45, Rom. 3:21. In Jewish literature this meaning occurs "sehr selten"; see H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N. T. aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1928, vol. IV, p. 416—cf. vols. I, p. 240 and III, p. 164-165.

[26] For instance, the author mentions (Connolly p. 11-12): the Law, Books of Kings (incl. Samuel), Prophets, "and the Gospel the fulfilment of these"; see also the sequel on p. 12; (the original Dutch underlying the clause from 'although, of course,...' up to 'prophecy' is not quite clear. G.M.).

[27] This term is discussed extensively in my article already cited.

[28] I pointed to this fact, op. cit. pp. 28-29.

[29] See 'The Significance of the Mosaic Law...', *passim*.

IS 1 CLEMENT 20 PURELY STOIC?*

The *1a Clementis* fights against the disorder in the church of Corinth caused by the dismission of some officers (ch. 44). The author stresses over and again the fact that one should not transgress the appointed rule, but do everything in its own order (ch. 40-41). The incidents in Corinth, however, do not form the contents of this letter; they are no more than the motive. They reveal that there is something wrong in this church and the letter from Rome tries to give a general instruction on the way in which the Christians have to behave themselves. It is an entreaty for peace and concord (63:2) in a general tone, but nevertheless closely connected with the point at issue[1].

Ch. 20 forms part of the subdivision 19:2—21:8. The author draws attention to the peace and benefits given by God the Creator. The whole universe moves around in good order according to God's command, from which he takes the lesson that it should be the same in the Church. 21:5 is a direct hit against the leaders of the Corinthian opposition and shows that the whole passage has a bearing upon the present situation. The text of ch. 20 runs as follows[2]:

> 1) The heavens are moved *by His direction* and obey Him in peace. 2) Day and night accomplish the course *assigned to them by Him*, without hindrance of one to another. 3) The sun and the moon and the dancing stars *according to His appointment* circle in harmony within the bounds *assigned to them*, without any swerving aside. 4) The earth, bearing fruit *in fulfilment of His will* at her proper seasons, putteth forth the food that supplieth abundantly both men and beasts and all living things which are thereupon, making no dissension, neither altering anything *which He hath decreed*. 5) Moreover, the inscrutable depths of the abysses and the unutterable statutes of the nether regions are constrained *by the same ordinances*. 6) The basin of the boundless sea, gathered together *by His workmanship* into its reservoirs, passeth not the barriers wherewith it is surrounded; but even *as He ordered* it, so it doeth. 7) For He said, *So far shalt thou come, and thy waves shall be broken within thee*[3]. 8) The ocean which is impassable for men and the worlds beyond it, are directed *by the same ordinances of the Master*. 9) The seasons of spring and summer and autumn and winter give way in succession one to another in peace. 10) The winds in their several quarters at their proper season fulfil *their ministry* without disturbance; and the everflowing fountains, created for enjoyment and health, without fail give their breasts which sustain the life of men. 11) Yea, the smallest of living things come together in concord and peace. All these things the great *Creator and Master of the universe ordered to be in peace and concord*, doing good unto all things, but far beyond the rest unto us who have taken refuge in His compassionate mercies through our Lord Jesus Christ, 12) to whom be the glory and the majesty for ever and ever. Amen.

The established order in nature is looked upon from a double point of view:

a) it is benefit to us that God has ordered it in this way, because what was to become of the world, if it were not so? it would be a chaos!

b) this harmony which reigns by God's will in His creation is an illustration, a model for everything which falls under the rule of God, *a fortiori* for His Church; otherwise one is disobedient to His will and falls under His judgment.

Therefore the author continues in 21:1 with the following conclusion: "Look ye, brethren, lest His benefits which are many turn into judgment to all of us, if we walk not worthily of Him, and do those things which are good and well-pleasing in His sight with concord."

This chapter is considered to be one of the crown-witnesses for Stoic influence upon this letter. It is a clear proof that I Clement has left the sphere of the Bible and that the "theologia naturalis" makes its *joyeuse entrée* in the church with all its disastrous consequences. According to von Harnack the whole framework of the letter is "Hellenisch"; ch. 20 belongs to the "Ausführungen ...., die über den Zweck des Briefs hinauswachsen und Religion und Naturanschauung so verbinden, dass diese jene zu verdrängen droht"[4]. Sanders devoted more than 20 pages to this chapter and adduced a large number of parallels from Stoic sources; his conclusion was: "Cherchant dans l'ordre cosmique des leçons d'édification morale, une fois de plus, Clément fait figure de disciple du stoïcisme moyen, plus ou moins pythagorisant"[5]. Sanders had Knopf as a great forerunner. In his commentary the latter said that there is of course influence from the LXX, where the majesty of the Creator and His work is praised, but he continues: "mit dem Hinweis auf die heiligen Bücher können die Ausführungen längst nicht zur Genüge erklärt werden. Schon der grosse Grundgedanke von 20: die Gesetzmässigkeit und Ordnung des Kosmos, die der vollendete Ausdruck der göttlichen Schöpfertätigkeit sind, ist ganz unjüdisch und überhaupt unorientalisch: der Geist griechischer philosophischer Frömmigkeit kündigt sich hier aufs deutlichste an"[6].

I do not want to question the value of these parallels offered by Knopf and Sanders from the Stoic tradition. The same root ταγ- which is so favorite to Clement[7] is found there, and the ὁμόνοια is praised by Stoics and Christian alike. Yet I cannot help thinking that there is a marked difference: among the Stoics the order seems more or less established in itself and makes men think that there must be behind it an organizing power, and that it is from the order of nature that this divine power can be known; in 1 Clement the order is established by the command of the Creator and reveals the *will* of God, the keynote of the passage being not

so much the order in nature as the command of God (see before the words in italics!). The Stoa starts from the phaenomena and finds in them the (pantheistic) God; the Christian author knew, that God "spake, and it was done; He commanded, and it stood fast" (Ps. 33:9), for him the τάξις is not a good in itself, but the result of God's will. The point of view of the Stoics is anthropocentric, that of 1 Clement theocentric, his "theos" being the God of the Old Testament[8].

Is the position of the scholars quoted before quite sound? Is this chapter "ganz unjüdisch"? It is remarkable to notice that, according to Knopf himself, this piece of Stoic cosmology is mixed up with thoughts from a different origin; at least in commenting upon 20:5 he says: "wir sind hier nicht mehr in der stoischen Kosmologie"; the use of the word *abyss* shows, "dass wir es insonderheit mit jüdisch-christlicher Ueberlieferung zu tun haben", and then at 20:8: "Hier tritt die griechische Anschauung, und zwar auch die der Wissenschaft wieder hervor und drängt die des A. T. zurück". The sequence of thought appears to be not so uniformly Stoic as was suggested before!

Besides, it is worthwhile to draw attention to the curious fact that some parallels found in Jewish literature are never mentioned and for some reason or other overlooked. They may follow here and be taken into account.

The so-called *first book of Enoch* with its extensive cosmological pictures was widely accepted in early Christianity[9]. In the very beginning, a vision of the future lot of the righteous and the wicked is given and the coming judgment is announced (1:9 "to convict all flesh of all the works of their ungodliness"). The chapters 2-5 must be quoted in full[10]:

> Observe ye everything that takes place in the heaven, how they do not change their orbits, and the luminaries which are in the heaven, how they all rise and set *in order* each *in its season* and transgress not against *their appointed order*[11]. Behold ye the earth, and give heed to the things which take place upon it from first to last, how *steadfast* they are, how none of the things upon earth change, but all the works of God appear to you. Behold the summer and the winter, how the whole earth is filled with water, and clouds and dew and rain lie upon it.
>
> 3) Observe and see how (in the winter) all the trees seem as though they had withered and shed all their leaves .....
>
> 4) And again, observe ye the days of summer how the sun is above the earth over against it .....
>
> 5) Observe ye how the trees cover themselves with green leaves and bear fruit: wherefore give ye heed and know with regard to all His works, and recognize how *He that liveth for ever hath made them so*. And all His works go on thus *from year to year for ever*, and all the *tasks which they accomplish for Him*, and their tasks change not, but *according as God hath ordained* so is it done[12]. And behold how the sea and the rivers in like manner accomplish and change not

their tasks *from His commandments*. But ye—ye have not been steadfast, nor done the *commandments of the Lord*, but ye have turned away and spoken proud and hard words with your impure mouths against His greatness. Oh, ye hard-hearted, ye shall find no peace" (follows a description of the execration of the impious).

That the fixed order of the universe has struck the author may also be seen from 41:5-8, where he mentions among other astronomical secrets:

> "And I saw the chambers of the sun and the moon, whence they proceed and whither they come again.... and their stately orbit, and how they do not leave their orbit, and they add nothing to their orbit and they take nothing from it[13], and they keep faith with each other, in accordance with the oath by which they are bound together[14]. And first the sun goes forth and traverses his path *according to the commandment of the Lord of Spirits* etc."[15].

In the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Test. Naphtali* 3 it is said[16]:

> "Be ye, therefore, not eager to corrupt your doings through covetousness or with vain words to beguile your souls; because if ye keep silence in purity of heart, ye shall understand how to hold fast the will of God, and to cast away the will of Beliar. Sun and moon and stars change not their *order*; so do ye change not the *law of God* in the *disorderliness* of your doings. The Gentiles went astray, and forsook the Lord, and changed their *order*, and obeyed stocks and stones, spirits of deceit. But ye shall not be so, my children, recognizing in the firmament, in the earth, and in the sea, and in all created things, the Lord who made all things, that ye become not as Sodom, which changed the *order of nature*. In like manner the Watchers[17] also changed the *order of their nature*, whom the Lord cursed at the flood".

There may be here some influence from 1 *Enoch*, whose name is expressedly mentioned in 4:1, though Charles considers this verse as a Jewish interpolation from the 1st century BC[18].

In the *Assumptio Mosis* 12:9-10 there is also a connection between God's order in nature and the deeds of men[19]:

> "The *lights of heaven*, the foundations of the earth have been made and approved by God and are under the signet-ring of His right-hand. Those, therefore, who do and fulfill the *commandments of God* shall increase and be prospered; but those who sin and set at nought the *commandments* shall be without the blessings before mentioned and they shall be punished with many torments by the nations".

With reference to Gen. 1 the author says that the whole universe was approved by God; it fulfilled the task set by God and was therefore favoured. This is a pattern for men. Transgression of Gods commandments will be followed by chastisement.

The same tone we hear in the last verses of the *Psalms of Solomon*, though they form only a torso. "The abruptness of the conclusion, the incompleteness of the treatment, and the absence of any doxology suggest

that the conclusion of the Psalm has been lost''[20]. What is left, is this (18:12-14)[21]:

> ''(It is He) who hath established in their courses the *light* (*of heaven*) for determining seasons from year to year,
> And they have not turned aside from *the way which He appointed* them.
> In the fear of God (they pursue) their path every day,
> From the day God created them and for evermore.
> And they have erred not since the day He created them''[22].

It should be observed that all the above references are to *Palestinian-Jewish* sources[23]. They all show the same ideas; the order in nature has been set by the commandment of God the Creator; the universe has been obedient and did not change the rules (τάξις!); therefore there is no curse in creation and the universal order can be an example for men. This theme has been most clearly worked out in *Enoch* 2-5 which offers a very close parallel to 1 Clem. 20 (order in nature opposed to the revolution among men, the ''people of God'' follow His commandments!), though it was not done so skilfully by the author of *Enoch*, who is a poor writer in comparison with the rhetorical ability of Clement.

That this example drawn from nature is not found more frequently in Jewish literature is not surprising. For though God is always adored as the Creator, His great and redeeming revelation according to Jewish theology has been given in the Thora, in the covenant of Sinai. In the Law of Moses His will has been made known, the rule according to which this chosen people is bound to walk. But at the same time it must be kept in mind that Bonsirven was right in saying: ''Le dogme de la création tient une place prépondérante dans la théologie et la piété juives''[24]. The thoughts of a universal order are not missing and one is not allowed to say with Knopf, that they are ''ganz unjüdisch''.

With two observations I want to terminate this paper:

1) the law in nature as an example for men is found both in Stoic and Jewish literature. Influence from one side on the other seems very improbable. This parallelism may be explained by pointing to the eastern (Semitic) origin of Stoicism[25], where this theme has become a school-tradition. Or must we assume a spontaneous origin on either side, for it does not demand very deep insight to express this thought! We must leave this point to future investigation of the whole problem of the relations between Hellenism and Judaism, but Rengstorf reminds us that ''heute schon so viel als sicher gelten (darf), dass die alte Antithese Hellenismus/Rabbinat nicht haltbar ist''[26].

2) as to the situation in 1 Clem. 20 the following solution may be proposed: the tinge of Stoic language is unmistakable, but this conception of the universe is subjected to another, the biblical idea of God (p.

54); the same conception and outlook is found among the Jews and it is not improbable that it formed a part of Jewish catechetical instruction and was known to St Paul[27]; this piece of Jewish-Christian tradition did fit very well into the fight against the opposition in Corinth (the church is the new "people of God") and, there being a parallelism with the ruling philosophy in Rome, he brought his ideas up to date by presenting them in a Stoic form.

Anyhow, the answer to the question in the heading of this article must, I think, be in the negative.

NOTES

* Appeared in: *Vigiliae Christianae* IV (1950), p. 181-189.

[1] As against R. Knopf, *Die Lehre der zwölf Apostel, die zwei Klemensbriefe*, Tübingen 1920, p. 42: "Doch geben die Römer über die unmittelbare Veranlassung des Schreibens hinaus in umfangreicher Wortfülle noch eine Anzahl von Ermahnungen über die Hauptstücke christlichen Wandels und Lebens, ohne dass man genauer sehen könnte, in welchem Zusammenhange diese Mahnungen mit dem eigentlichen Zwecke des Briefes stehen."

[2] Translation by J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part I, *S. Clement of Rome*, vol. II, London 1890, p. 282. In this and the following passages I have marked some phrases by special type.

[3] Job 38:11.

[4] A. von Harnack, *Einführung in die alte Kirchengeschichte, das Schreiben der römischen Kirche an die korinthische aus der Zeit Domitians (I. Clemensbrief)*, Leipzig 1929, p. 81, cf. p. 84.

[5] L. Sanders, *L'Hellénisme de saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme*, Louvain 1943, p. 130.

[6] Knopf, l.c., p. 76, cf. G. A. van den Bergh van Eysinga, *Oudchristelijke Geschriften*, Den Haag 1946, p. 174 and W. Lodder, *De godsdienstige en zedelijke denkbeelden van 1 Clemens*, Leiden 1915 (diss. Groningen), pp. 40-41.

[7] Cf. E. J. Goodspeed, *Index patristicus*, Leipzig 1907, s.v. διαταγή, ἐπιτάσσω, πρόσταγμα, τάσσω, ὑποτάσσω.

[8] Cf. the interesting note of von Harnack, l.c., p. 84, n. 2: "Sehr bemerkenswert aber ist, dass der stoische Tugendstolz dem Verfasser ferne liegt, trotz aller Hochschätzung der Werke. Die Einsicht: „Was hast du, das du nicht empfangen hast", tritt dem Tugendstolz entgegen". This shows that Clement really lived out of *another* "Lebensgefühl".

[9] See R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1913, vol. II, p. 181, on the influence of Enoch on patristic literature (1 Clem. 20 is not mentioned there).

[10] Charles's translation, l.c., p. 189-190.

[11] Greek text (according to H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*[3], Cambridge 1905, vol. III, p. 790): τεταγμένος ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ τεταγμένῳ καιρῷ, καὶ ταῖς ἑορταῖς αὐτῶν φαίνονται, καὶ οὐ παραβαίνουσιν τὴν ἰδίαν τάξιν.

[12] Greek text: καὶ πάντα ὅσα ἀποτελοῦσιν αὐτῷ τὰ ἔργα, καὶ οὐκ ἀλλοιοῦνται αὐτῶν τὰ ἔργα, ἀλλ' ὡσπερεὶ κατὰ ἐπιταγὴν τὰ πάντα γίνεται.

[13] Cf. on this expression: "they add nothing and they take nothing from it", my article: 'De la règle μήτε προσθεῖναι μήτε ἀφελεῖν dans l'histoire du Canon' in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 3 (1949), p. 1-36 (in: *Sparsa Collecta* II, Leiden 1980, p. 123-156); it denotes that they have subjected themselves to God's sacred order.

[14] G. Beer, in: E. Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudopigraphen des Alten Testaments*, Tübingen 1900, vol. II, p. 261 translates: "an dem Eidschwur haltend" and explains it: "durch den sie sich zum Gehorsam gegen Gott verpflichtet haben".

[15] Charles's translation, l.c., p. 212.

[16] Charles's translation, l.c., p. 337. Cf. R. H. Charles, *The Greek Versions of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, Oxford 1908, p. 149-150, a.o.: οἱ ἀστέρες οὐ καλύψουσι τὴν τάξιν αὐτῶν .... μὴ ἀλλοιώσητε νόμον θεοῦ ἐν ἀταξίᾳ; the same word τάξις is repeated several times.

[17] Name for the fallen angels, see Charles, l.c., p. 870, index s.v.; reference to 1 *Enoch* 6ff.

[18] Charles, l.c., p. 290, cf. E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*[4], Leipzig 1909, vol. III, p. 352-353.

[19] Charles's translation, l.c., p. 424.

[20] G. B. Gray, in: Charles, l.c., p. 651 note.

[21] Gray's translation, p. 652.

[22] This regularity in creation is also praised by Sirach 16:26-28.

[23] Not from Hellenistic-Jewish sources as Philo, where a great influence of contemporary philosophy (Stoicism) is found.

[24] J. Bonsirven, *Le judäisme palestinien au temps de Jésus-Christ*, Paris 1935, vol. I, p. 162, cf. p. 162-175.

[25] On this subject the reader may consult the article of M. Pohlenz, 'Stoa und Semitismus', in: *Neue Jahrbücher für Wissenschaft und Jugendbildung* 11 (1926), pp. 257-269.

[26] K. H. Rengstorf, 'μανθάνω', in: G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N. T.*, Stuttgart n.d., vol. IV, p. 406, n. 110.

[27] Paul's criticism of pagan culture and religion in Rom. 1:18ff. is directed against the "change" made by the pagans in the "natural" order; the underlying ideas are the same as in *Test. Naphtali* 3, quoted before (reference to Sodom!). St. Paul works here with well-known Jewish traditions, see H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer*[3], Tübingen 1928, p. 33 (he does not mention this parallel with *Napht.* 3); there is also influence of Stoic terminology according to Lietzmann, pp. 34-35, but M. Pohlenz, 'Paulus und die Stoa', in: *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft*, XLII (1949), pp. 69-82 has raised important objections against this view.

THE CHARACTER OF EARLY CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS IN THE PSEUDO-JUSTINIAN *ORATIO AD GRAECOS*

A short, insignificant piece of early Christian literature preserved in the *Corpus Apologetarum* leads me to make some remarks about the place and the value of the writings of the Apologists.

On the whole these second century authors have not had a good press in theological literature. It is customary to divide the history of the early Church before its stabilisation around AD 180 into three phases, the New Testament period—the Apostolic Fathers—and the Apologists. The usual estimate of this period is that the waters rapidly ran out, not in order to make the deserts blossom, but merely to run into sand. We need only place side by side the figures of Paul, 1 Clement, Justin Martyr or of John, Ignatius and Theophilus of Antioch, to sense the all too rapid beginning and continuing process of spiritual decline and rationalising superficiality. Not until the appearance of Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clement of Alexandria is there much that is worthwhile: the work and writings of the Apologists are arid and theologically unimportant.

Not long ago Mönnich argued here in a masterly survey of the subapostolic period, that there is something extraordinary about this group of theologians; while they are rather dull as writers, without significant insights as theologians, and harmless in the battle against paganism, and could therefore hardly be expected to merit much attention, nevertheless it is impossible to bypass them, as they sketched out some lines which became important for the theology of a later period, especially in the Logos doctrine[1]. This description has the air of an indictment. In this approach Mönnich is in line with the great handbooks of Church history and the history of its doctrine. Personally I consider this current verdict to be unjust. I find myself asking whether we are not applying yardsticks to these writers which are inappropriate. Do we place them—forgive the somewhat hackneyed expression—sufficiently 'within the context of their time'? It is in fact hard to escape the conclusion that the whole of this schematisation is badly in need of revision. Already some fifty years ago Gregory was asking when we would at last stop talking about the "Apostolic Fathers"[2], but here as elsewhere the law of inertia holds sway. Nevertheless, it will have to be recognised that terms such as "Apostolic Fathers" and "Apologists", which conjure up the suggestion of particular schools or circles and are then used in a schematic way, are untenable in a proper historical perspective because

they violate chronology and thereby blur our view of the true relationships in the period[3].

It is of course impossible to do justice to such issues within the compass of a contribution to a journal. I intend to study just one aspect and in so doing to indicate some lines of approach which, it seems to me, will need to be pursued as a matter of considerable urgency. Such a limited aim is in any case sufficiently important because we are dealing with the Christianity of the second century, in many respects such an obscure period, due to, *inter alia*, the scarcity of sources, yet a time in which the ark of the Church launched out onto the high seas of the civilised world, in which its very existence was at stake as perhaps never thereafter, in which decisions were made which proved to be of far-reaching significance though their origin and structure in this period are only barely discernible.

The work I have in view is hardly ever mentioned in discussions of the place of the Apologists. It is mentioned in the handbooks of early Christian literature not only for the sake of completeness but also because it raises a curious question.

In the edition of the collected works of Justin Martyr produced by von Otto in the middle of last century[4] we find a short, merely five chapters long *Oratio ad Graecos*. In the manuscript containing apologetic tracts which was lost in a fire in Strassbourg in 1870 it was credited to Justin Martyr, but most scholars today would consider this a mistaken ascription[5]. The fact itself is not so strange, as very many writings have come to us from antiquity flying a false flag. What is curious, however, is the relationship between this *Oratio* and a text published by Cureton in his *Spicilegium Syriacum*[6]. Both in structure and content the two pieces combine virtually word for word agreements with striking dissimilarities. The Syriac text, which clearly was translated from the Greek, makes no mention at all of Justin. Here the work is ascribed to a certain Ambrosius, about whom we hear no more than that he was a civic governor. Von Harnack has subjected both versions to a thorough comparative study[7]. According to him the relationship between them should be understood as follows: the *Oratio* is the original, probably written before AD 240; subsequently, but certainly before Constantine, it was worked over by a certain Ambrosius, of whom we know nothing else, on his own responsibility, and this version is the one which was later translated into Syriac. In any case all the indications are that it was written in Greece, possibly in Corinth. But the more exact information needed to answer "Einleitungsfragen" is lacking.

As things stand, it is virtually impossible for me to bring the problems raised here nearer to a satisfactory solution[8]. For our present purpose this does not matter. What is important, though, is an inspection of the con-

tents, of the line of thought and of the problems broached in this work. These are areas not affected by the question of the relationship between the versions, since the differences mostly have to do with *details* in the argumentation[9]. Hence we move to a summary of the contents.

The Greek text begins with these words: "Do not suppose, ye Greeks, that my separation from your customs is unreasonable or without prior investigation; for I found in them nothing that is holy or acceptable to God (ὅσιον ἢ θεοφιλές[10]). For the compositions of your poets are monuments of madness and intemperance. For anyone who becomes the pupil of your most eminent teacher (τῷ γὰρ ἐν παιδείᾳ παρ' ὑμῖν προύχοντι φοιτῶν) is in the most difficult position of all".

In the Syriac we find a much more extended opening. First, the heading reads: "Hypomnèmata[11], which Ambrosius, governor of Greece, wrote, who became a Christian; and all his fellow-councillors accused him and he fled from them and showed them in writing all their folly." Then, with a brief introductory phrase, follows the same opening as is found in the Greek text, but after the first sentence we find some differences: "And at the start of his discourse he answered them and said: 'Do not suppose, men of Greece, that my separation from your customs was improper or unjust. For I investigated (lit. went into) all the wisdom of poetry, rhetoric and philosophy. When I found there nothing right and worthy of God, I desired also to investigate the wisdom of the Christians. I learned and saw, who (they were) and when (they came into being) and what was new and strange (in their teaching) and what goods they hoped for, who have thereby become wise so as to speak the truth. Men of Greece, when I went into this, I found there no such foolishness as is to be found in the famous Homer."

Then follow several examples from Homer cited to show that the beginning and end of his epic poems is woman. "And who", he asks, "will agree with the drivel of Hesiod's Theogony?" Then citing from it some stories of the infamous behaviour of the gods he leads into this exhortation: "Read to Zeus, ye Greeks, the law against parricides and the penalty for adultery and the ignominy of pederasty! Teach Athena and Artemis the works of women and Dionysus those of men!". Further examples are drawn from mythology to demonstrate how the gods emerge as immoral and the heroes as effeminate from the tales of the dramatists. The example they set encourages immorality and can only be condemned: "Why are you, being a Greek, indignant at your son when he imitates Zeus (τὸν Δία μιμούμενος) and plots against you and has committed adultery with your own wife? Why do you count him your enemy and yet worship one that is like him (τὸν δὲ ὅμοιον αὐτῷ)? And why do you blame your wife for living in unchastity, but have yourself honoured

Aphrodite with shrines? Yes, if these things had been related by others, they would seem to be mere slander and not truth; but now your poets sing of these things and the histories current among you loudly shout them about." (In the Syriac text we find this interpolation: "persuade Solon to withdraw his laws and Lycurgus also not to make laws; let the Areopagus be dissolved and no longer pronounce judgement and let the Councils of Athens be no more"). The last chapter is an urgent summons to allow oneself to be instructed by the divine Word, which will lead to purity of soul.

This, then, gives us the structure and scope, the frame of this little work. When, however, we read it in full, we are struck by the vast catalogue of scabrous tales taken from mythology. Most of the work is taken up with these, but nothing concrete is said about Christian life and thought (there are just possibly two allusions to the letter to the Galatians 4:12 and 5:20-21 in chapter V but these are so veiled, that it is not evident that these are Scriptural quotations; for the rest references to the Bible are wholly missing). I could well imagine, that someone might after reading the *Oratio* say to himself—if only the writer had shown some glimpse of Christianity itself and spared us this catalogue of immorality among the gods and of the weaknesses of the heroes! Is it worth anything, as it is?

It certainly appears paltry. Even the argument that the sins of father Zeus promote immorality is not original. Geffcken has pointed out that this is a commonplace both among pagan philosophers and Christian apologists[12]. This piece could therefore provide an excellent illustration of Mönnich's verdict on the apologists in general: "The attack on paganism poses no real threat and is in the main simply borrowed from the anti-religious commonplaces of the Sceptics and Epicureans; the sins of the Olympic gods, in whom nobody believed anyway, are given extensive coverage, while the great theological questions of the day are left untouched"[13].

Though this may be the impression left with us on reading the *Oratio*, the question should be asked whether it held also good of the period itself, when this writing originated. At the close of his dissertation Bleeker pointed out that this sort of polemic, however strange it may sound to our ears, was fully on target, because this kind of paganism was very much alive; he argued this from the revival of pagan religiousness in the second century, from the use of mythology both in literature and on the stage, from the fact, that "this mythology was a hindrance.....to a true knowledge of God and led...men astray into the byways of superstition and immorality"[14]. These observations seem to me to be wholly justified, but in the light of our little work one or two points may be brought out in higher relief.

What, then, is the "Sitz im Leben" of this work and what is its significance for our understanding of Christianity in the second and the third century?

Several noteworthy points need to be mentioned. What strikes one on comparison of this booklet with other apologies for Christianity is that there is no attempt in this tract to counter attacks and accusations against belief. The author is not on the defensive, but entirely on the offensive. Secondly we notice that the opening has a very personal ring and gives an account of conversion to Christianity. Is this to be regarded as a purely literary device or is there a genuine, personal experience behind it? Thirdly there is the curious feature that, while becoming a Christian is here described as "separation from your customs", nothing further is heard about these "customs"; instead we are given an attack on mythology concentrated on the writings of Homer, Hesiod, and the other poets and historians. What, then, is the relationship between the thesis and the proof? A fourth point: in ch. I Homer is spoken of as "τῷ γὰρ ἐν παιδείᾳ παρ' ὑμῖν προύχοντι" (the Syriac version speaks of 'poetry, rhetoric and philosophy); in ch. V the verb παιδεύω is used three times, while we also find there the three disciplines spelled out earlier only in the Syriac and not in the Greek text; is this all pure accident? Why are the classic poets named, while the author makes no mention of more recent writers? Finally, why is the subject of the imitation of Zeus by the children introduced in ch. IV? Surely the study of classical mythology, to which our children are exposed in their tender youth, does not lead them into such temptations?!

What is more, the following consideration needs to be taken into account. However important it is to recognise that the argument, that the immorality of the gods awakens an immoral response, and the accompanying illustrations were not the original idea of our author but a commonplace, that information is by itself not enough. The significance which Geffcken's book has in this respect for the study of the apologists should not be underrated, but it would have been better if he had used the term "topos" instead of "commonplace"; that would at once have placed us in the ambience of antiquity. For educated men of the second and the third century the proper application of topoi was proof of oratorical skill and the very opposite of literary inability. What is significant, however, is not just the *occurrence* of a "topos" but its *application*[15]. What is its context here? We must not overlook the fact that the point is not so much aimed at the Olympic gods alone as against the ideas about gods and heroes of all kinds of writers and the immorality entailed by them. The different nuances found here would not be lost on readers in classical times; a simple summary offered in a commentary cannot do them justice.

By themselves these observations do not make us much wiser nor do we find more light in other Christian writings, but light is shed by a most unexpected source, namely by ..... Lucian, not ineptly named the "Voltaire of Antiquity" because of his sharp mocking style! In his particularly interesting *Nekyomanteia*, chs. III-VI, he makes his Menippus paint the following picture of his spiritual development (transl. A. M. Harmon): "While I was a boy, when I read in Homer and Hesiod about wars and quarrels, not only of the demigods but of the gods themselves, and besides about their amours and assaults and abductions and lawsuits and banishing fathers and marrying sisters, I thought that all these things were right, and I *felt an uncommon impulsion towards them*. But when I came of age, I found that the *laws*[16] contradicted the poets and forbade adultery, quarrelling and theft. So I was plunged into great uncertainty, not knowing how to deal with my own case; for the gods would never have committed adultery and quarrelled with each other, I thought, unless they deemed these actions right, and the lawgivers would not recommend the opposite course unless they supposed it to be advantageous. Since I was in a dilemma, I resolved to go to the men whom they call philosophers and put myself into their hands, begging them to deal with me as they would, and to show me a plain, solid path in life. That was what I had in mind when I went to them, but I was unconsciously struggling out of the smoke, as the proverb goes, right into the fire!", for the philosophers' counsels also proved to be wholly contradictory[17]. Deeply disappointed after such bitter experiences which once again failed to offer any solutions, he resolved to go to Babylon, there to seek out one of the disciples of Zoroaster, who might by means of magic incantations open the gates of Hades to him and allow him in the underworld to call upon Teiresias, to receive from that sage at last the decisive answer[18].

This is a fascinating picture drawn, as is so often the case with Lucian[19], true to life: as a child he is spellbound and stimulated by the mythological stories. But, what the gods (*nota bene*!) do is condemned by the laws, and thus a crisis arises from which philosophy offers no escape, while magic is expected to provide a resolution.

In order to gain a proper understanding one needs to be familiar with education in classical times. The classic definition of its theory is to be found in Plato's *Protagoras* (325 e-326 d): after the initial upbringing at home the child goes to school with the "didaskaloi"; for our purpose we take note of this significant feature of their teaching: "they give them to read the poems of good *poets* and force them to learn these by heart, in which there are many warnings but also many stories and words of praise and glory about good people of past times, in order that the child may zealously *imitate* (ζηλῶν μιμῆται) them and seek to become like them."

After education at school, "the state forces them moreover to learn the laws and to live by them". Thus the pattern is here repeated: for the child the poets; thereafter the laws. Ever since the time of Plato the principles of education formulated by him have been leading virtually without change.

Homer, Hesiod, the poets mentioned both by Lucian and by the unknown author of the *Oratio* provided along with the Tragedians the sourcebooks for Greek school-teaching; from these one learned reading, grammar, reciting; these also provided wise lessons to live by[20]. This last was especially vital; it is an aim with Plato and according to Plutarch *Quomodo adolescens*, VII, poetry has μιμητικὴν ὑπόθεσιν.

With the mention of the "pastor of Chaeronea"[21] we find ourselves back in the second century. The work of his just referred to, whose full title reads "How a youth should listen to the poets", is of particular importance for our subject. Plutarch here takes position, *inter alia*, against the Epicureans who wanted to abolish the reading of poetry[22]. On the contrary, he considers it to be valuable, because the children will learn profound wisdom in an attractive way through the pleasing form of myths (ch. XIV). But he is not blind to the dangers of reading such without judgment and the due discernment of distinctions. That is why he wrote this little book, in order to show how to gain the necessary benefit from such reading by a number of useful hints and appropriate examples from the poets[23]. The heart of his plea is given in these words: "But this must be recalled to the minds of the young, not once but often, and pointed out to them that poetry, whose purpose it is to lead them to *imitation* (μιμητική), adorns its subjects and characters with ornament and glittering glory but nevertheless does not forsake agreement with the truth, because imitation (μίμησις) depends for its power to lead precisely on that which is trustworthy." The young must learn not to attach too much to great names, for if they were to consider everything alright they would come to great harm. (chs. VII-VIII).

Thus we have discovered Plutarch's own views. A few hermeneutic rules will serve to bring us to the proper "application". But if it was deemed necessary to write this in some respects naïve little book with its occasionally very strange exegesis, then this is proof that something was wrong. Behind this calm dissertation one senses a clear response to resistance against the use of the classical poets in schools. It indicates a *crisis in education* which is not mentioned in the history books, but was none the less real for all that. The theory which we find in Plato was bound in practice to lead to conflicts.

The central place given to the poets in education and the summons to "imitation" (possibly strengthened by philosophical preaching of the

imitatio Dei[24]) raised the question of the 'sins' of the gods. What was one to do about them, especially when such sins were clearly condemned by the laws? The question became more acute if one took the gods seriously and refused to degrade them to pseudo-beings by the use of allegory[25]. It was certainly not true that nobody any longer believed in the existence of the Olympians. It was implanted in the minds of children from their earliest days by the old stories, then reinforced at school. The second century witnessed a religious revival; Hadrian, for example, completed the grand temple for Zeus Olympios at Athens, just one of his many works in the realm of worship in Greece. Many standard works on the history of the Imperial period give a distorted picture, because too little attention is paid to the quietly continuing observance of the old religion while interest is focused exclusively on new phenomena or philosophical "Umdeutung". The worship of the Olympians was not leading a book-existence in the studies of learned commentators but it was very much alive.

Seen against this contemporaneous background, which is the proper setting of the *Oratio*, several curious features of it become intelligible. The parallel with Lucian's account brings this apparently insignificant little tract to life. Its author starts with the *paideia*. He was caught up in the crisis of classical schooling. Thus we can understand his choice of these particular authors and what prompted him to argue that children might well one day "imitate" the wicked deeds of Zeus and the other gods[26]. Again, it now becomes clear for what reason the author brought the laws of state to bear against the gods. Now the final chapter with its repeated plea: "let yourselves be taught by the divine Word" also forms a meaningful conclusion.

The comparison with Lucian in particular makes clear that we are not handling a literary piece from the scholar's study but a document rooted in personal experience. These people were not cast adrift by a "failure of nerve", as Gilbert Murray[27] would term it, but by a "crisis of education". Some would have seen only too clearly, that the well-meant counsels of a Plutarch would simply not do; they presuppose either that a standard by which to measure good and evil is already available or that one cannot in the end take the gods seriously. For Lucian's *Menippus* the path ended in magic, the one solution offered by the East and grasped at by many; for the revival of magic in this period there is abundant evidence. For this "Ambrose" the path led into Christianity. He appears to have come to faith by reading the Bible but how that came into his hands remains hidden from us. We are left with the impression that he was drawn above all by the moral character of the message[28].

Thus we see that this apologist most certainly dealt with one of the great issues of his day which he had made his choice. Of course there were other issues; that is not denied. But that does not mean that these happened to be within his purview at that time. One question faced him existentially and demanded an answer; he searched for it and found it. His conversion meant a "separation from your customs", but that would not be an exclusively moral issue. The *ethè* were the expression of a total life style rooted in religion. The *paideia* of the Greeks was also aimed at the maintenance of the *patria ethè* = the *mos maiorum*. On this point one should compare the quotation from the *Clementine Homilies* IV 18 (see note 26) and remember that all kinds of social activities in antiquity were accompanied by sacrifices. Conversion to Christianity made a visible difference in this area; for the "imitation of God" of which Paul speaks in Eph. 5:1-2 brings quite other consequences with it than the "imitation" of Greek schooling.

I hope that I have in this way succeeded in showing this little tract, which seems at first glance to be as grey as the paper on which it is printed in von Otto's edition, to be a fascinating *document humain*, the testament of a living, wrestling human being. That was, of course, somebody living in classical times and facing questions other than those of the later Church. I deliberately avoided the attempt to give a word by word study of ch. V, because our attention was required for the problem of the Apologists in their battle against paganism.

It may have become clear that certain circles in the second century—beware of generalisations!—faced a crisis in education, which provided opportunities for the furtherance of the Gospel. This seems to me an important factor to take into account for the "Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums". In that magisterial book on this theme von Harnack makes no mention of this aspect at all. The reason is to be found in the fact that he has given far too little weight to the spiritual life of the Imperial period in his account.

That it is possible to gain an understanding of this tract has been demonstrated by studying it in the context of its time. I hope that this example will make clear how writers like the Apologists should be studied. Until now the tendency has been to read them—and *mutatis mutandis* this also applies to other early Christian writers—too much in isolation instead of seeing them in a living relationship to their times. In the handbooks on the history of doctrine the history of religion of the Imperial period tends to be treated as propylaia; one merely passes through them to enter the sacred halls of Church theology *pur sang*. There is virtually no trace of an awareness of Toynbee's "challenge and response" with regard to the world in which the writers lived. I must

resist the temptation to deliver theoretical statements about the approach to the history of the early Church. One thing only: anyone who really wants to understand this vitally important period must not only read and re-read his patristic authors but must pay no less attention to the study of contemporary "paganism" in its many facets. Otherwise the enterprise will become and remain docetic!

NOTES

* This article was originally published in: *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* VII (1952-1953), p. 129-141.

[1] C. W. Mönnich, 'Het Christendom van de na-apostolische tijd', in: J. H. Waszink-W. C. van Unnik-Ch. de Beus, *Het oudste Christendom en de antieke cultuur*, Haarlem 1951, vol. II, p. 425-426.

[2] C. R. Gregory, 'Joseph Barber Lightfoot', in: J. J. Herzog-A. Hauck, *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*, 3rd. ed., Leipzig 1902, vol. XI, p. 489.

[3] Cf. my remarks in: 'De oud-christelijke letterkunde tot Irenaeus' in: *Het oudste Christendom en de antieke cultuur*, vol. II, esp. p. 84-85.

[4] *S. Iustini philosophi et martyris Opera quae feruntur omnia*, 2nd. ed., ed. J. C. Th. von Otto, vol. II, Jena 1849 (= *Corpus Apologetarum Christianorum saeculi secundi* III 2), p. 2-15.

[5] See A. von Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur bis Eusebius, II Die Chronologie*, vol. I. Leipzig 1897, p. 513, n. 1; O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, 2nd. ed., Freiburg i. Br. 1912, vol. I, p. 231-232; A. Puech, *Histoire de la littérature grecque chrétienne*, Paris 1928, vol. II, p. 214-215; J. Quasten, *Patrology*, Utrecht 1950, vol. I, p. 205-206.

[6] W. Cureton, *Spicilegium Syriacum*, London 1945, p. 38-42 (syr. text); 61-69 (Eng. translation).

[7] A. von Harnack, 'Die pseudojustinische Rede an die Griechen', in: *Sitzungsberichte der königlichen preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften* 1896, p. 627-646; the conclusions of this study can be found summarised in von Harnack's *Chronologie*, p. 513-517 (Bardenhewer's work cited above is entirely dependent on this).

[8] I hope shortly to tackle some of the questions concerned with this inter-relationship more thoroughly in *Vigiliae Christianae*, as Harnack's reconstruction is not entirely satisfactory.

[9] Cf. A. von Harnack, op. cit., 1896, p. 638: "... dass er (the Syriac text) den Gedanken von G nichts Wesentliches hinzugefügt hat. Überall handelt es sich über Hinzufügung secundärer Dinge ..., um eine Vermehrung der Beispiele und Belege".

[10] The word "theophiles" is difficult to translate here, as it can have both the passive meaning of "loved by the gods" and the active one of "loving the gods"; one had further to reckon with polytheistic and monotheistic interpretations implied in the first part of this composite.

[11] The Syriac text preserves the Greek word.—A. Harnack commented as follows on this title, op. cit., p. 641-642: "wie kann diese lebendige kurze Rede, die in G einfach und sachgemäss πρὸς Ἕλληνας heisst, als 'Hypomnemata' bezeichnet worden sein? Weder Commentarii noch Acten, noch Notizen können gemeint sein. War die Rede, die auch in G^2 noch immer den Character einer energischen Ansprache trägt, ohne Aufschrift überliefert, so konnte es schwerlich Jemandem nachträglich einfallen, ihr den ganz unpassenden Titel 'Hypomnemata' zu geben. Doch einer konnte diesen Titel wählen, nämlich der Bearbeiter selbst, wenn er damit ausdrücken wollte, dass er kein originales Werk vorzulegen die Absicht habe, sondern eine Compilation bieten wolle aus

Abschriften und Aufzeichnungen, die er sich gemacht."—There is, however, no real cause to let this title puzzle us and lead us into this kind of speculation, for we find the following meaning given s.v. in H. G. Liddell-R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*, 9th ed., Oxford 1940, vol. II, p. 1889: "*dissertations* or *treatises* written by philosophers, rhetoricians, and artists" with references of such usage provided.

[12] J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, Leipzig-Berlin 1907, p. xviii and 62.

[13] C. W. Mönnich, op. cit., p. 425.—Similar sentiments are expressed by L. D. T. Poot, *Het oudchristelijk avondmaal en zijn historische perspectieven*, Wageningen 1936, p. 3: "the early Christian apologists, who tended to lose themselves in a paper war against antiquated problems".

[14] J. J. Bleeker, *De polemiek der eerste Christenen tegen de heidense mythologie*, Groningen 1897, p. 106 ff.

[15] See for instance the treatment of a Christian "topos" in my article on 'The significance of Moses' Law for the Church of Christ according to the Syriac Didascalia', [in this volume p. 7-39].

[16] The "laws" are the civic laws; the most famous of the lawgivers were considered to be Solon and Lycurgus (the function of the laws in connection with education will subsequently become clear). In this and later quotations certain words which are of particular importance for the argument are italicised.

[17] We should compare with this the account of Justin Martyr's conversion as described in *The Dialogue with Trypho*, I ff. with its account of his wanderings through the fields of philosophy.

[18] About such reasons for becoming a follower of Zoroastrianism see J. Bidez-F. Cumont, *Les Mages hellénisés*, Paris 1938, 2 vols.

[19] One can read in M. Caster's, *Lucien et la pensée religieuse de son temps*, Paris 1937, p. 178 ff, how Lucian regarded the Olympian gods with a critical approach in many respects similar to that of the Christians.

[20] On the subject of education in antiquity one ought to read the fascinating survey by H. I. Marrou in his *Histoire de l'éducation dans l'antiquité*, Paris 1948, esp. pp. 223-235; see also W. Jentsch, *Urchristliches Erziehungsdenken*, Gütersloh 1951.

[21] This is the very apt title given to him by J. J. Hartman in his interesting book about Plutarch, *De Avondzon des Heidendoms*, [The Setting Sun of Paganism], 3rd ed., Leiden 1924. This book is still well worth reading for its vivid description of that period.

[22] On this point Christians and Epicureans found themselves in agreement; in Lucian's *Alexander*, (XXV; XXXVIII) they are in fact mentioned together as opponents of the prophet of Abonouteichos. Cf. also M. Caster, *Études sur Alexandre ou le Faux Prophète de Lucien*, Paris 1938. p. 45-46.

[23] There are a number of striking parallels in the examples adduced by Plutarch with those cited in the *Oratio ad Graecos*; we would be straying unnecessarily beyond the boundaries of this argument if we were to discuss these parallels here, as we would have to draw other writings into our study; what this similarity does illustrate is that these were "critical points".

[24] Cf., for instance, Seneca's "vis deos propitiare? bonus esto. satis illos coluit quisquis imitatus est" (*Epistula* 95).—W. Michaelis in Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1942, vol. IV, *s.v.* μιμέομαι, does not mention the use of this word in the sense that we are familiar with in school terminology but does point out on p. 664 that a more detailed study of the use of "imitation" as a concept is particularly needed in the field of ethics.

[25] Cf. the pseudo-Justinian *Cohortatio ad Graecos*, II: "These and such like things did Homer teach you; and not Homer only but also Hesiod. If therefore you believe your most distinguished poets, who have provided the genealogies of your gods, you must needs either suppose that the gods are beings such as these, or else believe that there are no gods at all." (Note that the poets are here cited in a way which is different from that in the *Oratio*!).

[26] Cf. *Clem. Hom.* IV 17: Those who profess themselves to be grammarians and sophists "being themselves incontinent, ... lay hold of this mythical pretext; and as

imitators of superior beings (μιμηταὶ τῶν κρειττόνων), they practise unseemly things with freedom." That is why people living in the countryside are less sinful, because they have not learned godlessness from an evil instruction (ἐκ παιδείας κακῆς) "For they who from their childhood learn letters by means of such fables, while their soul is yet pliant, engraft the impious deeds of those who are called gods into their own minds; whence, when they are grown up they ripen fruit, like evil seeds cast into the soul. And what is worst of all, the rooted impurities cannot be easily cut down, when they are perceived to be bitter by them when they have attained to manhood. For every one is pleased to remain in those habits which he forms (ἐθίζεται) in childhood; and thus, since custom is not much less powerful than nature, they become difficult to be converted to those good things which were not sown in their souls from the beginning."

[27] The title of the fourth chapter of Gilbert Murray's famous *Five Stages of Greek Religion*, in which he discusses this period.

[28] This is of course a provisional judgement because it rests primarily on the evidence of the Syriac text, though ch. V also points in this direction. Further witnesses to this striking aspect of Christianity for pagans can be found in Galenus; see R. Walzer, *Galen on Jews and Christians*, Oxford 1949, p. 65 ff.

ZUR BEDEUTUNG VON ΤΑΠΕΙΝΟΥΝ ΤΗΝ ΨΥΧΗΝ BEI DEN APOSTOLISCHEN VÄTERN*

In den letzten Jahrzehnten wird der semitische Hintergrund des ältesten Christentums immer mehr herausgearbeitet. Dabei ist es nicht in allen Fällen leicht, festzustellen, ob in Sprache und Ausdruck ein Semitismus vorliegt oder nicht. Die Frage läßt sich nicht im Allgemeinen erledigen, sondern muß durch eine genaue Analyse des vorhandenen Materials von Fall zu Fall entschieden werden. Ich möchte das gerne an einem interessanten und nicht unwichtigen Beispiel erläutern.

In der soeben erschienenen 4. Auflage seines Wörterbuchs bemerkt Walter Bauer unter dem Worte ταπεινόω "Nach alttestamentlichem Sprachgebrauch bedeutet ταπεινοῦν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν oder ταπεινοῦσθαι *sich kasteien, fasten*". Diese Bedeutung ist unterschieden van „sich demütig machen, demütig werden". Dasselbe wiederholt sich bei ταπείνωσις[1]. Also: in den meisten Fällen hat die Wurzel ταπεινο- eine innerliche Bedeutung, aber an einigen anderen Stellen ist es Bezeichnung eines äußerlichen Benehmens. Bauer folgt hier Adolf Deißmann, nicht eben einem Freund der Semitismen in der altchristlichen Sprache, der in seiner Besprechung des Rachegebets von Rheneia auf den Zusammenhang dieser Verbindung mit ענה נפש hingewiesen hat[2]. τὴν ψυχήν soll dann als Reflexiv aufgefaßt werden, wie es im Semitischen des öfteren geschieht[3]. Man verweist dann meistens auf die LXX.

Nun ist es sehr deutlich, daß die Wurzel ταπεινο- im altchristlichen Sprachgebrauch einen von dem Profangriechischen abweichenden Sinn hat. Die Griechen haben es immer *in malam partem* verwendet, während es bei den Christen eine Tugend bezeichnet wie im AT. Es ist sehr merkwürdig zu sehen, wie hellenistische Juden (Philo und Josephus) in dieser Hinsicht sich nicht ihrer Bibel, sondern dem Profangebrauch anschließen[4]. Deshalb könnte es scheinen, als ob der Ausdruck ταπεινοῦν τὴν ψηχήν als ein reiner Semitismus erwiesen ist.

Wie steht es nun damit in der altchristlichen Literatur? Bei der Beurteilung muß natürlich Barnabas 3, 1ff. ausscheiden, weil es hier in einer Anführung aus Jes 58:4 ff. steht. Man findet die Verbindung in I Klemens 55:6 von Gott ὃς ἰδὼν τὸ ταπεινὸν τῆς ψυχῆς αὐτῆς (von Esther) ἐρρύσατο τὸν λαόν, und Hermas *Mand. IV* 2:2 τὸ μετανοῆσαι, φησίν, σύνεσίς ἐστιν μεγάλη· συνίει γὰρ ὁ ἁμαρτήσας, ὅτι πεποίηκεν τὸ πονηρὸν ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ κυρίου, καὶ ἀναβαίνει ἐπὶ τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ ἡ πρᾶξις, ἣν ἔπραξεν, καὶ μετανοεῖ καὶ οὐκ ἐργάζεται τὸ πονηρόν, ἀλλὰ τὸ ἀγαθὸν πολυτελῶς ἐργάζεται καὶ ταπεινοῖ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν καὶ βασανίζει, ὅτι ἥμαρτεν[5]. Hier könnte es

leicht scheinen, als ob wirklich der Ausdruck eine technisch-rituelle Bedeutung angenommen hat, wofür auch andere Stellen in Hermas, wie *Vis. III* 10:6 und *Sim. V* 3:7 geltend gemacht werden können, während 1 Klem. 53:2; 55:6 auch die Verbindung von ταπείνωσις mit νηστεία hat. Es wäre dann eine äußerliche Handlung, wie wir sie als Begleitung des Fastens kennen: durch Sack und Asche machte man sich unkenntlich[6].

Ist es aber wirklich ein Abklatsch des Hebräischen, unverständlich für griechische Ohren, die hier nur technische ,,Bibelsprache'' hören konnten? Nun findet diese Wortverbindung sich auch bei Lukian, Nigrinus 21. Es wird da gesprochen über das Benehmen vornehmer Herren, die sich als Könige verehren lassen: οἱ δὲ σεμνότεροι καὶ προσκυνεῖσθαι περιμένοντες, οὐ πόρρωθεν οὐδ' ὡς Πέρσαις νόμος, ἀλλὰ δεῖ προσελθόντα καὶ ὑποκύψαντα καὶ τὴν ψυχὴν ταπεινώσαντα καὶ τὸ πάθος αὐτῆς ἐμφανίσαντα τῇ τοῦ σώματος ὁμοιότητι τὸ στῆθος ἢ τὴν δεξιὰν καταφιλεῖν[7].

Obwohl Lukian aus Samosata stammte, kann man doch nicht sagen, daß er in seinem Sprachgebrauch semitisch beeinflußt ist. ταπεινόω hat hier in Übereinstimmung mit dem allgemeinen Sprachgebrauch den ungünstigen Sinn: kriecherisch sich erniedrigen, wie z. B. ταπεινός im *Somnium* 13 neben χαμαιπετής und χαμαίζηλος. Man kann bei Horst a. a. O. auch viele Beweise finden, wie das griechische Bewußtsein sich gegen die Proskynese aufgelehnt hat. τὴν ψυχήν kann hier auch nicht als Reflexivum aufgefaßt werden, da deutlich von einem πάθος der Seele gesprochen wird, womit die Körperhaltung überinstimmt; ,,Seele'' steht somit, gut griechisch, neben und im Unterschied von ,,Leib''. Der ganze Ausdruck beschreibt deshalb die seelische Verfassung des sich Beugenden. Nichts zeigt hier, daß Lukian sich ,,technisch'' ausdrückt, etwas für Griechen Unverständliches sagt, und mit Fasten hat es überhaupt nichts zu tun!

Man kann auch wohl auf Josephus, *B. J.* I 33:1, § 647 hinweisen, wo von Herodes gesagt wird: τεταπείνωτο δὲ τὴν ψυχὴν ταῖς περὶ τῶν τέκνων συμφοραῖς, ὡς μηδ' ἐν ὑγιείᾳ τι τῶν ἡδέων προσίεσθαι (die Parallelstelle *Ant.* XVII 6:1 gibt kein Licht), denn hier ist der gedrückte Zustand der Seele gemeint im Gegensatz zu der Gesundheit des Leibes.

Liest man nun die oben angeführte Klemensstelle mit der Parallele 53:2 Μωυσέως ... ποιήσαντος τεσσεράκοντα ἡμέρας καὶ τεσσεράκοντα νύκτας ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ταπεινώσει wieder, dann gibt es hier nichts Auffälliges.

Die ταπείνωσις ist von Klemens eingefügt worden; in der alttestamentlichen Vorlage Ex. 34:28, Deut. 9:9 bzw. Esth. 4:16 wird nur vom Fasten gesprochen. Doch kann man νηστεία und ταπείνωσις nicht als Hendiadyoin auffassen. Diese beiden Beispiele dienen dazu, um den Schluß 56:1 vorzubereiten ὅπως δοθῇ αὐτοῖς ἐπιείκεια καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη, um damit das Ganze zu retten. Das zeigt, daß Klemens diese Einfügung nicht umsonst gemacht hat, sondern sehr absichtlich; nicht das Fasten an

sich war das Wertvolle, sondern die seelische Haltung des Sich-selbst-übersehens, die damit verbunden sein soll. Diese soll auch bei den ,,Aufrührern'' in Korinth anwesend sein; das Fasten hat damit nichts zu tun. Vom asketischen Gesichtspunkt waren diese Beispiele untauglich, wohl aber vom ethischen der Demut. Neben die äußere Gebärde des Fastens tritt die innere Haltung der Seele, die damit ganz in Übereinstimmung ist. In dieser Weise wird auch immer von Klemens von der ταπεινοφροσύνη als Selbsterniedrigung und Opferbereitheit gesprochen[8].

Zu den Hermasstellen läßt sich Folgendes bemerken:

1. Auch *Mand.* IV 2:2 ist die *seelische* Haltung gemeint, wie aus dem ganzen Zusammenhang dieses Mandatums hervorgeht, denn es handelt sich um das Herz, das Gefühl einem Weibe gegenüber, um Einsicht; die Reue des inneren Menschen ist hier gemeint. Wie wenig ,,technisch'' diese Verbindung ist, sieht man in *Sim.* VII 4 ἀλλὰ δεῖ τὸν μετανοοῦντα βασανίσαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχήν καὶ ταπεινοφρονῆσαι ἐν πάσῃ πράξει αὐτοῦ ἰσχυρῶς καὶ θλιβῆναι ἐν πάσαις θλίψεσι ποικίλαις, wo eine Vertauschung der Verben stattfindet[9]. Auch in *Mand.* XI 8 πρῶτον μὲν ὁ ἔχων τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ θεῖον τὸ ἄνωθεν πραΰς ἐστι καὶ ἡσύχιος καὶ ταπεινόφρων καὶ ἀπεχόμενος ...ἐπιθυμίας... τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου καὶ ἑαυτὸν ἐνδεέστερον ποιεῖ πάντων τῶν ἀνθρώπων und *Sim.* VIII 7:6, wo gesagt wird, daß in den Geboten nichts über πρωτεῖα und δόξα gesagt wird, sondern περὶ μακροθυμίας καὶ περὶ ταπεινοφρονήσεως ἀνδρός. ἐν τοῖς τοιούτοις οὖν ἡ ζωὴ τοῦ κυρίου, ἐν τοῖς διχοστάταις δὲ καὶ παρανόμοις θάνατος bezieht es sich nur auf psychologische Zustände.

2. In *Visio* III 10:6 und *Sim.* V 3:7 könnte man eine technisch-rituelle Bedeutung annehmen, wobei ταπεινοφροσύνη = Fasten wäre (so z. B. Dibelius, z. St. und Kwa. S. 125). Bei näherem Zusehen läßt sich das doch, glaube ich, nicht halten. In *Vis.* III 10:6 steht πᾶσα ἐρώτησις ταπεινοφροσύνης χρῄζει· νήστευσον οὖν, καὶ λήμψῃ ὃ αἰτεῖς παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου. (7) ἐνήστευσα οὖν[10]. Man soll hier bei der Exegese nicht die Bedeutung von οὖν übersehen[11]; das ist keine Gleichstellung, sondern ist eine Folge des Vorhergehenden: ,,demnach, folglich''. Erst soll die richtige seelische Einstellung da sein, dann erst kommt die Äußerung im Fasten. Ist jedes Fasten sowieso das richtige, ist es an sich ,,vollkommen''? Diese Frage wird in Sim. V besprochen, wie aus 1:3 zu ersehen ist, denn das gewöhnliche Fasten des Hermas ist nutzlos, eitel: οὐκ οἴδατε, φησίν, νηστεύειν τῷ κυρίῳ, οὐδέ ἐστιν νηστεία αὕτη ἡ ἀνωφελὴς ἣν νηστεύετε αὐτῷ. In 1:5 wird gesagt, was dieses wirkliche Fasten sein soll: μηδὲν πονηρεύσῃ ἐν τῇ ζωῇ σου, καὶ δούλευσον τῷ κυρίῳ ἐν τοῖς προστάγμασιν αὐτοῦ καὶ μηδεμία ἐπιθυμία πονηρὰ ἀναβήτω ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ σου· πίστευσον δὲ τῷ θεῷ· καὶ ἐὰν ταῦτα ἐργάσῃ καὶ φοβηθῇς αὐτὸν καὶ ἐγκρατεύσῃ ἀπὸ παντὸς πονηροῦ πράγματος, ζήσῃ τῷ θεῷ· καὶ ταῦτα ἐὰν ἐργάσῃ, μεγάλην νηστείαν ποιεῖς καὶ δεκτὴν τῷ θεῷ. Dann folgt ein doppeltes Gleichnis über den Sklaven, der mehr tut als nötig ist

und sich über seine Mitsklaven erhebt. In 3:6 wird dann noch einmal das vollkommene Fasten umschrieben; wieder ist es nicht Enthaltung von Speise und Trank, sondern die Reinheit der Gedanken[12]. Dann ist es sehr wichtig, die Konstruktion von 3:7 zu beobachten. Es fängt an mit συντελέσας τὰ γεγραμμένα = der Inhalt vom vorhergehenden Paragraphen; also das Psychische geht voran; dann folgt, daß er nur Brot essen und Wasser trinken soll, um das Mehr, das er anderenfalls für seine Mahlzeit genommen haben würde, Bedürftigen zu geben[13]; καὶ οὕτω ταπεινοφρονήσεις, ἵν' ἐκ τῆς ταπεινοφροσύνης σου ὁ εἰλικρινῶς ἐμπλήσῃ τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν καὶ εὔξηται ὑπὲρ σοῦ πρὸς τὸν κύριον. (8) ἐὰν οὖν οὕτω τελέσῃς τὴν νηστείαν ὡς σοι ἐνετειλάμην, ἔσται ἡ θυσία σου δεκτὴ παρὰ τῷ θεῷ (vgl. auch *Vis.* II 6 über den Armen, der für den Reichen betet). In dieser Weise zeigt der Mensch, daß er sich nicht überhebt, weil er die ärmlichste Nahrung nimmt. Da findet eine ,,seelische Kommunikation'' statt[14]; mittels der Gabe, Frucht der demütigen Gesinnung, wird der Arme zu Dankbarkeit und Gebet gebracht, weil seine Seele voll geworden ist. Daß ταπεινοφροσύνη hier nicht dasselbe wie ,,Fasten'' ist, zeigt auch der unmittelbar folgende Satz. Die Demut ist das Komplement des Fastens, ohne sie gibt es kein richtiges Fasten. Hermas hat bereits vorher gefastet, aber das war nicht das echte. Man kann nicht sagen, daß die Demut dem Fasten untergeordnet ist, in der Richtung einer ,,Selbsterniedrigungs-Askese''[15] geht; vielmehr ist es im Gegenteil so, daß die Wertlosigkeit der äußerlichen Handlung nachgewiesen wird und das Fasten unter die Gesinnung subsummiert ist.

In dieser Weise geben alle Stellen ein einheitliches Bild, das auch von Heiden in seiner sprachlichen Form verstanden werden konnte. Daß das christiche Ideal des ταπεινός-Seins für ihn nicht annehmbar war, ist natürlich im ganz andersartigen Menschenideal begründet (man sieht den Gegensatz sehr deutlich bei Hermas *Sim.* VIII 7:6 ausgesprochen; die Erwerbung der δόξα ist doch das höchst Erreichbare in dieser Welt nach hellenistischer Ansicht[16]).

Ich glaube nicht, daß es nötig ist, in diesem Zusammenhang das Material der LXX zu untersuchen, denn da hat man es nicht mit einem spezifisch griechischen Ausdruck zu tun. Es soll aber gefragt werden, wie es mit ענה נפש bestellt war. Wohl möchte ich bemerken, daß auch dort das seelische Element in Vordergrund steht, eben wo das Fasten miteinbegriffen ist. Die altchristliche Gemeinde hat hier auch an die prophetische Verkündigung angeknüpft, wie Jes 58 zeigt, wo es wirklich ,,die Seele demütigen'' heißt, und es ist ganz richtig, wenn Barnabas 3 das anführt[17]. Und dies ist auch in Übereinstimmung mit wichtigen Aussagen der spätjüdischen Theologie, wo das Fasten auch nicht an sich gewertet wird, sondern nur als Ausdruck frommer Gesinnung, derBuße[18]. Es ist in dieser Frage nicht belanglos, worauf man den Akzent fallen läßt!

Somit hoffe ich nachgewiesen zu haben, daß in dem Ausdruck ταπεινοῦν τὴν ψηχήν bei den Apostolischen Vätern kein Semitismus oder Bibelsprache vorzuliegen braucht, sondern daß er auch für die Griechen sehr wohl verständlich war. Der Verfasser des unschätzbaren Wörterbuchs möge diese kleine Korrektur als ein Zeichen der größten Dankbarkeit entgegennehmen!

ANMERKUNGEN

* Erschienen in: *Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 44 (1953), S. 250-255.

[1] W. Bauer, *Griechisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des NT und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*[4], Berlin 1952, Sp. 1463.

[2] A. Deißmann, *Licht vom Osten*[4], Tübingen 1923, S. 357-358.

[3] L. Köhler, *Lexicon in Veteris Testamenti Libros,* Leiden 1951, S. 627; F. Blaß-A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*[7], Göttingen 1943, 283, 4.

[4] Reichliche Belege bei: Kwa Joe Liang, *Het begrip Deemoed in I Clemens,* Utrecht 1951 (Dissertation).

[5] Es ist merkwürdig zu sehen, daß Clemens Alexandrinus, *Strom.* II 13, 55:6 (St., S. 143) in seiner Anführung das ταπεινοῦν fortläßt: βασανίζων δὲ ἐφ' οἷς ἥμαρτεν τὴν ἑαυτοῦ ψυχὴν ἀγαθοεργεῖ; es findet sich der Begriff überhaupt nicht bei ihm nach Stählins Index; ist das reiner Zufall oder Absicht?

[6] Vgl. H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum NT aus Talmud und Midrasch,* Bd. IV, München 1928, S. 103ff.; Mt 6:16 und die Kommentare z. St. Interessant ist auch Josephus, *Ant. Jud.,* XX 4:2 καὶ σποδῷ τὴν κεφαλὴν καταισχύνας ... ἐνήστευσεν.

[7] Diese Stelle ist nicht angeführt und besprochen bei J. Horst, *Proskynein, Zur Anbetung im Urchristentum nach ihrer religionsgeschichtlichen Eigenart,* Güttersloh 1932; wohl gibt er andere Stellen aus Lukian, wo es sich um ,,proskynein'' handelt.

[8] Vgl. die ausgührliche Besprechung bei Kwa a. a. O.

[9] Siehe auch das Vorhergehende in § 2 θλιβῆναι, ἵνα κἀκεῖνοι μετανοήσωσι καὶ καθαρίσωσιν ἑαυτοὺς ἀπὸ πάσης ἐπιθυμίας τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (derselbe Ausdruck in § 4 und *Mand.* IX 8); in § 6 heißt es: μόνον παράμεινον ταπεινοφρονῶν καὶ λειτουργῶν τῷ κθρίῳ ἐν πάσῃ καθαρᾷ καρδίᾳ (der Gottesdienst ist hier die rechte ethische Haltung).

[10] Daß Fasten zur Verstärkung des Gebets dient, ist auch aus dem Judentum und hellenistischer Umwelt bekannt, vgl. W. Bousset-H. Greßmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*[3], Tübingen 1926, S. 179, Mt 6 und P. R. Arbesmann, *Das Fasten bei den Griechen und Römern,* Gießen 1929, *passim.*

[11] Vgl. meine Bemerkungen über dieses Wort in: '1 Clement 34 and the ''Sanctus'' ', in: *Vigiliae Christianae* V (1951), S. 221-222. [In diesem Band, S. 326ff.].

[12] § 6 πρῶτον πάντων φύλαξαι ἀπὸ παντὸς ῥήματος πονηροῦ καὶ πάσης ἐπιθυμίας πονηρᾶς καὶ καθάρισόν σου τὴν καρδίαν ἀπὸ πάντων τῶν ματαιωμάτων τοῦ αἰῶνος τούτου (vgl. oben, Anm. 9) ἐὰν ταῦτα φυλάξῃς ἔσται σοι αὕτη ἡ νηστεία τελεία.

[13] Vgl. auch Jes 58:10 LXX καὶ δῷς πεινῶντι τὸν ἄρτον ἐκ ψυχῆς σου, καὶ ψυχὴν τεταπεινωμένην ἐμπλήσῃς.

[14] Ich glaube, daß dies am Besten illustriert werden kann durch die schönen Ausführungen von J. Pedersen, *Israel, its Life and Culture,* London-Copenhagen, vol. I-II über ,,Soul'' und ,,Blessing''.

[15] A. von Harnack, Sanftmut, Huld und Demut in der alten Kirche, in: *Festgabe für J. Kaftan,* Tübingen 1921, S. 125.

[16] G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT,* Stuttgart 1935, Bd. II, S. 238.

[17] Auch der Kronzeuge Deißmanns, Ps 34 (35):13, beweist durch die Hinzufügung von ἐν νηστείᾳ eben, daß ,,die Seele demütigen'' nicht das gleiche wie ,,Fasten'' ist. — *Ps. Sal.* 3:8 ἐξιλάσατο περὶ ἀγνοίας ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ταπεινώσει ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ, deutet auch auf die seelische Haltung (Gebhardt cj. ψυχῆς — das ταπεινώσει ist etwas sonderbar, cf. J. Viteau, *Les Psaumes de Salomon,* Paris 1911, S. 269).

[18] Bousset-Greßmann a. a. O. S. 389f. und 179f. und Billerbeck a. a. O. S. 106 ff.

CHRISTIANITY AND NATIONALISM IN THE FIRST CENTURIES OF THE HISTORY OF THE CHURCH*

In a famous aphorism Huizinga warned us against a mistaken approach in historical research, namely that of serving up morsels from the stew of traditions without due discrimination[1]. The questions which the researcher wants to put to the past need to be sharply defined.

This is certainly good counsel to be taken to heart when we intend to give an account of the relationship between "Christianity and nationalism" in early Church history. Whereas the concept of "Christianity" in our study may be reasonably well defined, this is assuredly not the case with "nationalism". We will, therefore, take as our starting-point, the working hypothesis outlined in the first of this series of lectures;[2] for, while this might eventually need revision, it will meanwhile provide the researcher concerned with tracking down the facts with a very useful divining rod.

I will, if I may, repeat from that lecture two sentences which form the kernel of the definition. First of all the following definition of the concept of "nation": "a group of people, organised as a self-governing community or at least desiring to be such a community, who feel themselves to be united by the shared experience of a common past and generally also by a measure of homogeneity of language, culture and ancestry and who desire to maintain that unity". And secondly, this definition: "nationalism is the aspiration to maintain one's own nation and to promote its well-being because of the conviction that it represents certain values and has a particular purpose to fulfil".

While it is true, as Smitskamp himself points out, that this concept first became clearly observable only towards the end of the 18th century, and while it is admitted that it is extremely risky at all times and certainly in this instance to rummage around in ancient history with modern problems in mind—studies of social history of antiquity in particular furnish a number of frightful examples—, nevertheless we ought not thereby to be prevented from posing the question: did early Christianity at some point in its development encounter any kind of nationalism, and, if so, what stance was taken towards it?

The question itself is clear and straightforward. The only missing point is a more accurate delineation of "the first centuries". In order to gain a reasonably coherent picture, it seemed sensible to me to limit this investigation to the period which closed with the famous Edict of Milan

(AD 313). There is a measure of unity about this period. After that time great changes occur; Christianity becomes the religion of the emperors; increasingly the Roman empire becomes prey to centrifugal forces; the frontiers of the Empire are no longer capable of withstanding the onslaught of the surrounding nations. Rapid disintegration is particularly evident in the West and with it the emergence of all manner of "barbaric nations". It would indeed be fascinating and important to include research into this period from the 4th to the 6th century in our study. One has only to think of the extraordinary way, in which Constantine's emperorship is linked with Messianic ideas in Eusebius, of the nationalistic Roman backlash expressed in the Third *Relatio* of Symmachus and in the battle over the altar of Victory, of Augustine and his *De Civitate Dei,* the political bible of later centuries, of the impressive figure of Cassiodorus at the court of Gothic Kings, and of the question whether there is a connection between the currents of nationalism and the emergence of the great sectarian churches of the East. However in view of the time allotted to us and for the sake of clarity we will have to leave all this untouched.

It is interesting to discover that, as far as I know, no substantial study of this specific issue has so far been published. E. L. Woodward's *Christianity and Nationalism in the Later Roman Empire* (London 1916) deals precisely with that period which we have decided to exclude. Several scattered references may be found in the well-known and well-documented book by C. J. Cadoux[3] but they provide no coherent picture. In this respect it is important to stress once again that we are concerned with the relationship with "nationalism", a theme which is to be clearly distinguished from the relationship between "Church and State" which has of course received ample treatment in connection with the persecution of Christians. We ought also to distinguish it from the relationship between "Christianity and Culture", which moved between the concept of a *praeparatio evangelica* and the violent rejection aired in Testullian's famous *adagium*: "What has Athens in common with Jerusalem?" Of course our enquiry is bound to touch on these two issues tangentially but no more than that.

Two further observations in conclusion of these prolegomena. The first is this. Just at the time when this contribution was first delivered as a lecture (March 29th, 1951) an article was published on the same theme written by that expert in the field of Christian antiquity, Erik Peterson[4]. This striking coincidence should not be passed over in silence. Peterson's point of departure is a somewhat different problem, namely the question posed to the early Christians by the co-existence of a wide variety of nations. For this reason the publication of his article has not called for a

revision of my own study. Peterson's interesting piece of work sheds light on a number of ideas, which tend in my pages to remain in the shadows, and I can thus heartily concur with his words: "und so müssen wir am Schluss unserer Darlegung bekennen dass wir nur einen kleinen Ausschnitt unseres grossen Themas behandelt und wichtige Fragen kaum mehr als angerührt haben" (p. 91).

My second observation is of a rather different nature. An essay by C. H. Moore with the already rather unpromising title, "The Decay of Nationalism under the Roman Empire"[5], begins with the less than encouraging observation: "Many will doubtless feel that the proper treatment of my subject should be as short as that famous chapter on snakes in Ireland which Dr. Johnson knew by heart; for, strictly speaking, there was nothing in antiquity which corresponds exactly to the nationalism of our own day" (p. 27). Does that not imply that our theme is destroyed, reduced to an imaginary problem? Fortunately that proves to be only a run-up to his thesis. He goes on to argue that while it is true that modern nationalism in our sense of the word first originated in the period after the French revolution, it is nevertheless quite proper within limits to recognise the concept of nationalism in antiquity. He continues as follows: "The units within which community feeling existed were smaller and of a somewhat different character than today; but that a sentiment comparable to the modern national spirit was to be found at times in certain ancient units cannot be denied". The enquiry is thus not entirely hopeless, though it may well not prove to be as fruitful as one might hope, the reason, no doubt, why others have to date by-passed the issue. It is, however, important for our theme to recall that Christianity, once again to quote Tertullian, grew up "in the shadow of Judaism": and among the Jewish people nationalism was most certainly a live issue, of which the burning Temple of AD 70 is the blazing symbol. As Judaism was in effect the first nationalistic power encountered by Christianity in its development, we must clearly pay attention to this fact in our study.

Our research, therefore, naturally falls into two parts, the relationship to Jewish nationalism and that towards that of the Roman Empire, which we will describe more fully in due course.

1. *Christianity and Jewish nationalism*

When the Jewish scholar, Klausner, in his two great works devoted to the emergence and early development of Christianity raises the question why the Jews rejected Christianity despite the many Jewish elements both in Jesus and in Paul, he replies that it could not have been otherwise, if they wished to remain in being as a nation. "Das Judentum jener

Zeit aber hatte nur ein Ziel: die kleine Nation, die Bewahrerin grosser Ideale, vor dem Untertauchen im Meere der heidnischen Kultur zu retten, damit sie imstande sei, langsam und allmählich die ethischen Lehren der Propheten im politischen Leben und in dieser Welt durch die Mittel eines jüdischen Staates und Volkes zu verwirklichen"[6]. He thus considers, correctly in my view, that the division was caused largely by the attitude towards nationalism.

In 63 BC the national independence of the Jewish People came to an end. Since that time Palestine had become part of the Roman empire. Nevertheless the Temple and its cult remained in being. Even for the many Jews who were forced to live in the Diaspora Jerusalem continued to be the "metropolis". Nothing could root out from Israel the conviction that all this was only a temporary phase. The election of this People had been clearly declared in Deut. 7:6: "For you are a people holy to the Lord your God; the Lord your God chose you out of all nations on earth to be his special possession". These words proved to be the star of hope in times of oppression, a beckoning light pointing to a shining future, predicted once upon a time by the prophets and now by the apocalyptists.

Despite everything Israel remains the People of God. The Torah is the gift declaring His choice, keeping His People in God's way. Circumcision is the sign of the covenant. It was the call as a people, as the children of Abraham, with joy to take upon themselves the yoke of the Kingdom of God. One day they would be redeemed, and the saying would come true that Jerusalem would stand at the top of the mountains and that all the nations would climb up to her to learn the Torah. They would live in the Holy Land in freedom, and all those who had been scattered abroad would be brought home.

How this redemption would be accomplished was a matter of dispute. Messianic expectations were more passionate, more activist in some circles than in others. What cannot be doubted is that Judaism was not simply a religion but an inextricable forging together of the worship of God and politics.

The People of Israel, who worshipped the one true God, believed themselves to be unique in the world! This understanding of the mutual relationship between Yahweh and His people was the yardstick against which everything was measured. By this standard all other distinctions yielded to the one and only significant one, Israel and the "Peoples" (it is typical of Judaism that this word "peoples-Gojim = ethnè" should also mean "the heathen"). Hence the attitude of sharp rejection of everything that was not Jewish, an attitude which made the Gentiles speak of *odium generis humani.*

One could illustrate this view in a number of ways, though perhaps the most eloquent expression is to be found in the 17th Psalm of Solomon, probably written under the fresh impact of Roman occupation.

23. "Behold, O Lord, and raise up unto them their King, the Son of David, at the time in which Thou seest, O God, that he may reign over Israel, Thy servant.
24. And gird him with strength, that he may shatter unrighteous rulers
25. And that he may purge Jerusalem from nations that trample her down to destruction...
28. And he shall gather together a holy people, whom he shall lead in righteousness,
And he shall judge the tribes of the people that has been sanctified by the Lord his God,...
32. And he shall have the heathen nations to serve him under his yoke"[7].

The world as a whole is not lost sight of, and there are occasional universalist notes to be heard, but all this is subject to a full-blooded nationalism. "The world was created for the sake of His People" (*Assumption of Moses* 1:12).

With this nationalism, which continually gave birth to messianic leaders such as Theudas and Judas the Galilean, which had its underground of "Zealots" and spat upon the tax-gatherers as collaborators, Christianity also came face to face.

The nature of this relationship is most sharply signalled in the well-known discussion between Jesus and the disciples on the way to Emmaus (Luke 24). When Jesus was crucified, his followers were totally disillusioned: "We had been hoping that he was the man to liberate Israel". The nationalistic expectation here linked with the work of Jesus is clear, but it had run into checkmate. Jesus rejects this view with the following words: "How dull you are! How slow to believe all that the prophets said! Was the Messiah not bound to suffer thus before entering upon his glory?" [NEB, edd.]. The aim of Christ is wholly other than that of Israelite nationalism; the way of Christ is wholly other than that of liberation from the dominion of Rome!

If one reads the Gospels against the background of Jewish nationalistic aspirations and sees the events in the context of the tension generated by the occupation of the 'Holy Land', then the indications everywhere are that Jesus squarely set His face against such nationalism, however much it is also true that His person and work can only be understood within the Jewish context. In His first sermon in the synagogue at Nazareth He cites Gentiles as examples: the blessing came to them not to Israel. While being a descendant of Abraham has in itself no saving power, yet Jesus

chooses to stay with Zacchaeus, a tax gatherer, and salvation comes to this man's house, because he *also* is a son of Abraham. Appeal to the forefathers is cut short by Jesus' "But I say to you ...". When news reaches him about the bloodbath, in which Pilate ordered a number of Galileans to be slaughtered in the temple precinct, Jesus does not burst out in burning indignation against the tyrant but calls the people to repentance. The typical nationalist test-question, whether it is right to pay taxes to Caesar, is dismissed with the terse sentence: "Then pay Caesar what is due to Caesar, and pay God what is due to God". Nowhere in Israel can Jesus find such faith as in a Gentile centurion, an incident to which Matthew adds: "Many, I tell you, will come from east and west to feast with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob in the Kingdom of Heaven. But those who were born to the Kingdom will be driven out into the dark". When a lawyer one day raised the urgent question of the identity of the "neighbour" spoken of in the Law—is it your fellow-Jew or not?—, then Jesus answers him with a parable which is mistakenly called that of "The Good Samaritan"; according to Jewish thinking the priest and the Levite should have been "neighbour" to this victim but in fact it turned out to be the accursed Samaritan (note the fine little touch, in that the scribe clearly cannot bring himself to mention the word itself and uses a circumscription to avoid doing so!). Jerusalem is not the city of great kings but the place in which the prophets are murdered (the Apocalypse will later speak of Sodom) and true worship will be in spirit and in truth but not in this place, which will be totally destroyed because it could not recognise the hour of its visitation.

While the Jews await the coming of the Messiah in the future, the New Testament preaching declares that He has come in Jesus. In Him the Kingdom breaks in, a Kingdom not of this world, one in which sacrifice is the law of life. But to share in the Kingdom relationship to Him is decisive. "This people honours Me with its lips but their heart is far from Me": with these words He parts company with the empirical reality of Israel. He brings the New Covenant sealed with His blood on the Cross. "The Son of Man has come to seek and to save what is lost"; this is to be the rule and it is not confined to the chosen people. This universalist note in His preaching which is sounded in the eschatological discourse of Mark 13 (vs. 10 "But before the end the gospel must be proclaimed to all the nations") and rings out like a clarion call in the great commission: "Go forth therefore and make all nations my disciples" is not isolated but runs through all His proclamation.

It is not admissible at this point to enter as contrary evidence the conversation of Jesus with the Syrophoenician woman, in which Jesus says that He has only been sent to the lost sheep of the house of Israel. This

saying concerns the course of the earthly ministry of Jesus; at first He is bound to work with Israel, the divine "must" is to be fulfilled. The Law and the Prophets must find their fulfilment in the destiny of the Messiah before the wider perspective can be recognised. On this issue it is worth noting that there is a significant difference between Christ and Paul; the latter, when work in the synagogue proved barren, turned to the Gentiles, whereas Jesus remained true to His people because God's way of salvation for the world lay along that road.

Among the first disciples, who had not infrequently failed to grasp the purpose of Jesus during His time with them on earth, this radical change in the scope of this spiritual kingdom was at first not understood. They remained in Jerusalem, and only gradually, to judge by the reports in Acts, did it dawn on them that the boundaries of the Covenant people no longer coincided with the Old Israel (the Ethiopian eunuch; Cornelius). Even so many a battle had yet to be fought before Jew and Gentile were finally regarded as equally placed for the gift of Salvation.

The burden that weighed heavily on Paul was this wearing controversy. The letter to the Galatians is the mighty document in which Paul fought with all his power to establish the full sufficiency of the work of Christ. For how did the issue stand with Christ? Did He only allow the Gentiles to become part of Israel, while still in effect maintaining that the observance of the Law was the way to God or was Christ Himself all-sufficient?

Before we enter more fully into Paul's attitude towards Jewish nationalism let me say a word in passing about Jewish Christians. For in Palestine there was a circle of people who wanted to go on being fully practising Jews while at the same time recognising Jesus as the Messiah. Not much is known about them: for it seems very debatable to me whether it is legitimate simply to apply to the period before AD 70 the reports of later writers about Ebionites and similar heretical groups. One fact however is firmly established, and it is one of particular significance for our study. During the Jewish rebellion of AD 67-70, that tremendously powerful national resistance movement without equal within the history of the Roman empire (even if it was not supported by every Jew), the Jewish Christian group literally distanced itself from this by retreating to Pella. They had no desire to align themselves with this attempt to liberate Israel and create a kingdom. This action naturally later earned them reproach from the Jewish side, but it is solid proof that these people, for whom Judaism fully maintained its validity, were very much aware of the difference of this from Jewish nationalism and by implication critical of it.

When we come to Paul, the world as a whole enters into the purview of the New Testament. He has seen the great cities of his time, Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth and Rome with their colourful mixture of people from all manner of nations; he has visited Athens, which sought to preserve her former glories by dreaming of the past. It is striking that despite this he appears to have no eye for these national distinctions or for their history. In Athens he is struck by their idolatry. In his letters the distinction is mentioned in typically Jewish fashion: Jews and Gentiles. Sometimes he speaks of the "Greeks" (e.g. in Romans and 1 Cor.) but even there the context makes abundantly clear that "Greek" refers to the representatives of the best of Hellenistic culture and is used as a summary concept for the pagan world. That he did know of national differences can be deduced from, for example, Col. 3:11, where the formula, that in Christ there is no distinction between Jew and Greek, is expanded with the words "barbarian and Scythian". Despite this such distinctions are for him irrelevant to the decisive division between Jew and Gentile. What mattered was not national or political differences but relationship to the living God; idolatry or monotheism.

Paul recognises that the crucial questions posed by the Jew and the Greek were radically different; the Jews call for signs and Greeks look for wisdom. The apostle's missionary work took full cognizance of this; for the Jew he desired to be as a Jew and to the Greek as a Greek. This can be clearly demonstrated from the methods of argument employed in his letters. Even so this was not the decisive stance. In this respect it is particularly significant to mention the letter to the Romans. Although he acknowledges the special privileges granted to Israel, in that they "were entrusted with the oracles of God", the thrust of his argument none the less leads to the equality of all before the judgment of God: "all alike have sinned and are deprived of the glory of God". The only way out is not nationalistic ambition or active cultural politics of either Greek or Jewish fashioning but: "and all are justified by God's free grace alone, through his act of liberation in the person of Christ Jesus". In this way he encompasses in one stroke both the corruption of Hellenistic culture and the heights of religion. The same point is made along a different, more horizontal line when Paul discusses in Romans 9-11 the place of Israel in the purpose of God: the unfathomable way of rejection will nevertheless lead to the bringing in to salvation of the fulness of the Gentiles and the whole of Israel.

As for himself, Paul was neither able to cut himself off from nor even to renounce his ties with the concrete reality of the people of Israel which for him too remained "God's People". When necessary he could speak of them with boasting. But, "their election is to serve God by making

known His revelation'', no cause for national pride: redemption is liberation from the universal burden of sin, not from the burden of being occupied territory: the true Israel is not determined by descent but by faith, which cuts right across national boundaries: the choice is Israel after the flesh or after the Spirit. In Eph. 2 it is said—possibly with an allusion to the warning notice by the Temple precinct forbidding entry to Gentiles on pain of death—that in Christ ''the enmity which stood like a dividing wall between them'' was broken down; for Christ has created one new humanity; all distinctions, therefore, whether physical or national fall away in this new creation.

Even though the apostle lived as a Jew, and even though Jerusalem meant more to him than Rome, nevertheless he looked for the Jerusalem that is above, who is the Mother of us all. The Philippians are told that our citizenship is in heaven; on earth we are aliens. Paul does not look at events in regional terms but in their cosmic context. The opposition is everywhere the same (1 Thess. 2:14); so is the preaching albeit suitably adapted. Christ was indeed born of the seed of David but nevertheless He is the first born of all creation. He has received a name which is above all names, and at His name every knee will one day bow. Even when all the distinctions which are part of the variety of God's gifts are mentioned (1 Cor. 12), the emphasis is still on the unity of the Christian community, as it is in Ephesians: ''There is one body and one Spirit, as there is also one hope held out in God's call to you: one lord, one faith, one baptism; one God and Father of all ...''.

Summarising we may conclude, that while Paul is familiar with national distinctions they are for him totally unimportant: there is no place for nationalistic activity. The centre lies not on earth but in heaven, not with a group of men but with man standing before the judgment of God. Where certain nations are aware that they are in one respect or other better than others, then we may say at the most that they are to use such wealth in the service of others, most certainly where that wealth consists of the words of God. But where such things give a nation unique value, as is the case with Israel's law, they may never be used as a barrier excluding outsiders from salvation: the freedom freely bestowed by Christ is not national liberation but liberation from sin against God, the freedom of the children of God.

The same position is to be found, sometimes expressed in different words, in the rest of the New Testament. Some points may yet be mentioned. First, the attitude to nationalism was not a pressing question, for it only comes into view sporadically. That is understandable at a time when the Roman empire gave the world a sense of unity, where Jewish nationalism could scarcely present any problems after AD 70 and where

Christian congregations largely consisted of Gentile Christians. Secondly, the nation belongs to this world, which is passing away. The words of the writer to the Hebrews—"here have we no continuing city but we seek one to come"—give the general direction of thought. Thirdly, I want to draw attention to 1 Peter 1:18, which speaks of the empty folly of the ways of your forefathers". There is no doubt that Peter is addressing people with a pagan background. The word he uses in speaking here to Christians from various regions in Asia Minor and from all sorts of tribes (I intend to return to this briefly later) is "patroparadotos", which particularly demands our notice in connection with nationalism. This description links tradition and "fatherland" and has undertones of "trustworthy and to be revered". It is all the more striking, then, that Peter by characterising such tradition as "empty folly", i.e. by implication idolatrous, disposes of it by a single stroke of his pen as something from which one is, thank God, set free by the sacrifice of Christ. In the fourth place, a look at the Revelation of St. John. The violent attack on the "whore of the seven hills" makes the Apocalypse definitely one of the most important testimonies to what Fuchs has called "der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom"[8], but there is no sign here that she is replaced by some other chosen people. Instead of the earthly Jerusalem arising once more in glory renewed, John has a vision of the "new Jerusalem coming down out of heaven from God, made ready like a bride adorned for her husband". Moreover we should notice the adoration of the Lamb; there besides the chosen from the people of Israel is a vast throng "from every nation, of all tribes, peoples, and languages", words which remind us of the worship of the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar (Daniel 3). All of them are those who have been cleansed by the blood of Christ and made into the new people. Here also the former things have passed away. The divisions of earth by nation and language have lost their significance; that is the ideal which finds its still unfinished counterpart in the Church on earth. Whereas we see in Genesis 11 that peoples are divided by the barriers of different languages, and where in Acts 2 we find that these divisions, however real and present, cannot hinder the preaching of the Gospel, the whole problem is gone in the vision of the future and towards that end the Church of Christ sets its face.

No doubt differences, especially of language, continue here on earth; that is acknowledged freely but they have no significance whatever for man's relationship with God!

"No doubt differences continue here on earth", I said just now. One striking instance is Paul's dream (Acts 16:9) in which he recognises a man from Macedonia. When he follows his beckoning, his journey takes him to Philippi. Paul's activity there provokes a reaction which is quite

remarkable and provides a natural if unsought for transition to the second part of this lecture. Let us recall that it takes place in Philippi, a Roman *colony*. Paul and his companions are accused as follows: "These men are advocating customs which it is illegal for us Romans to adopt and follow". If we leave aside the confusion between Judaism and Christianity, this passage is so striking because we have here a report of public resistance against the introduction of Jewish customs; Roman nationalist consciousness is rising up in rebellion!

And, in fact, to become a Jew (here a Christian) was not simply a matter of accepting certain doctrines but included a total change of life-style. In the current atmosphere of syncretism the acceptance of monotheism would by itself not have been too shocking an affair, but to place oneself under God's Law also led to a radical shift in social terms. A fascinating example is the famous history of the conversion of King Izates to Judaism. When the King wants to be circumcised, both his wife and a Jewish merchant warn him against this on the grounds that it would lead to trouble with his subjects if he should desire to live according to, for them, entirely alien customs. A little further on (Josephus, *Ant.* xx 41) we find the words: ζηλοῦν τὰ πάτρια τῶν Ἰουδαίων. With such a conversion the customs of one's forefathers were at stake. This brings us directly to the question which next requires our attention in this discussion.

2. *Christianity and Roman nationalism*

In his book *The Early Church and the World* (p. 146-147) Cadoux pointed out that the problem of nationalism only arose for Christians when faced with the people of Israel, because there alone among the nations of the Roman empire could a strong nationalistic feeling be found. "Outside Israel and Christendom, the 'nations' were lumped together in a homogeneous mass whose inner distinctions and conflicts had little or no significance for the Christian mind". There is certainly an important kernel of truth here, and, were this the whole truth, then our investigation would cease at this point. But we have already seen, that the preaching of the Gospel posed a threat to the *mores Romani*. Some aspects of the problem appear to me not to get the attention from Cadoux which they deserve.

Did nationalism exist in the Roman empire? Long ago Fustel De Coulanges demonstrated in his now classic work *La cité antique*, how that patriotism was gradually undermined, which called men to give themselves *pro aris et focis* because the polis alone was the place within which life was received, fostered and protected. In the Roman era its basis, the city-state, collapsed. C. H. Moore summarised a complex of

causes which all contributed to the weakening of nationalism: Roman dominion, which did allow all kinds of local administration to continue, at the same time rendered such autonomy practically ineffectual by dividing areas on a purely geographical basis and subjecting everything to a strongly centralised government. In his opinion this explains the virtual absence of nationalist movements in the various parts of the empire. At the same time the Roman patriotism of a Cicero, a Horace, or a Virgil was almost annihilated because the common people had no part in government, because the empire was too vast and far-flung, because within the breadth of this imperium cosmopolitan and individualistic ideas widely preached by all manner of philosophical streams went hand in hand, because the "theology" of the kinship between God and man naturally produced the concept of a universal brotherhood and, finally, because the influence of Eastern religions directed men's gaze to the hereafter and away from this often rather miserable world. That patriotism was not entirely defunct is shown according to Moore by the national reawakening under Symmachus, which is constantly brought on stage as its typical expression.

I should not care to dispute these observations. On the contrary, it is in fact striking that the history of the Imperial period does furnish numerous examples of social rebellions but not of the genuinely nationalist resistance which was offered by the Jews until its back was finally broken in AD 135 by the exceptional measures of Hadrian. Whenever one reads in Plutarch about the great men of Greece, then this serves not to underline the glory of Greece but to promote virtue. During this period the distinction between Hellenes and barbarians is, as Jüthner showed in an interesting study[9], no longer a matter of politics but of culture. The idea which had gained common currency in all sorts of circles is well expressed in the words of Epictetus: "If what the philosophers teach about the kinship between gods and men be true, then we must say with Socrates: 'I am not an Athenian but a citizen of the world'" (*Diss.*, I 9:1).

That did not, however, mean that one did not have an eye for certain distinctions. Slaves, for instance, were divided *per nationes* and different regions were deemed to provide their specialities: the Greeks were much sought after as grammatici, Asians as cooks and musicians, Africans as bearers of sedans etc. One looked to Egypt with its ancient and mysterious religions with deep reverence. In philosophical debate Carneades used the argument, so often repeated subsequently, of the many and varied customs to be found in diverse nations to counter the deterministic teaching of the astrologers. Karl Holl has demonstrated from all sorts of patristic sources that the use of national languages

persisted in Asia Minor despite strong Hellenising influences in that region[10]. The same phenomenon can be observed in Egypt; very early, probably as early as the beginning of the third century, Christian documents existed translated into Coptic, the language of the people.

We can thus trace various factors which would normally tend towards the growth of nationalism. Why this lacked vigour and, where it did exist, tended to languish, is a question which may be answered by a look at the Jews. That which sharply distinguished them from surrounding nations was their religion: Judaism was not swept away by syncretism. Undoubtedly the various national religions and shrines were allowed to continue, but they were all regarded as merely manifestations of the one being; in the end it all comes to the same. This is clearly stated by Plutarch: "...just as the sun and the moon and the heavens and the earth and the sea are common to all, but are called by different names by different peoples, so for that one rationality which keeps all these in order and the one providence which watches over them and the ancillary powers that are set over all, there have arisen among different peoples, in accordance with their customs, different honours and appellations". (*de Iside et Osiride* 67, 377E-378A, translation of Loeb edition). Everything is really more or less the same. If one reads the dissertations of Aelius Aristides on the variety of gods, it is apparent that for this warm admirer of Asclepius they are all very much the same. How very different the issue stood with the Jews. There the wholly other, the promise of God, was at the centre, and the holy land was profaned. Yet despite this strong religious impulse, even they no longer dared open rebellion after AD 135, but confined themselves to cursing godless Edom (i.e. Rome). Once again overwhelming power had the last word! Moreover the positive aspect ought not to be overlooked: the Imperium Romanum brought with it the offer of *pax romana*!

A conspicuous characteristic of the authors of the Imperial period is that the consideration of separate nations immediately conjures up visions of violence and warfare. Cicero wrote: "Those who declare that it is one's duty to stand up for the interests of one's fellow-countrymen but not to have regard for those of foreigners disturb the unity of the human race". Lactantius takes over this sentence word for word in a dissertation in which he poses the question: "What are the advantages for our fatherland but the disadvantages of another state or people?" (Cicero, *De Officiis* III 6; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* VI 6). As far as Plutarch is concerned the liberty of Greece has been bought at the expense of endless civil wars. Both the pagan elder Pliny and the Christian Origen can only see cause for war in national divisions and are grateful that these are past. A constant theme of Eusebius is how an end has come at last to the domi-

nions of all kinds of tyrants and democracies with their attendant destructions and sieges. Thanks to the Imperium peace and prosperity are now the rule. Not only during the time which followed close upon the bloody procession of civil wars but throughout the Imperial period there is a chorus of gratitude for the peace bestowed by Imperial rule. Even if much of this were to be scrapped as rhetoric, there is sufficient witness here to genuine and deeply felt gratitude.

When Philo the Jew goes to the emperor Caligula to plead for his people after the riots in Alexandria, he argues *inter alia* as follows: "Everyone is endowed by birth with love for one's fatherland and for the customs of one's forefathers: about this, O emperor, thou needest not to be taught, for thou dost passionately love thine own fatherland and dost honour its institutions" (*Leg.* 277). Thus Philo here appeals to the Roman's love of his country and believes that he can do so with a good chance of success. We encounter in this plea the two elements of significance for our study: the Roman love for his fatherland and reverence for the customs of his forefathers. These constitute two important components.

Notwithstanding the powerful conception of the unity of the human race there is still a desire to maintain the customs of one's forefathers. The testimony placed upon the lips of a pagan by Clement of Alexandria: " ... but, as you say, the traditions handed down to us by our ancestors may not be uprooted without disrespect" (*Protrept.* 10) can be adorned with plenty of parallels. The Stoics showed profound respect for the national religion, and even the Sceptics could salvage religion with the rule: "one thing is sufficient for me, that is that it was thus handed down to us by our forefathers" (Cicero *De Natura Deorum* III 9). A neo-Pythagorean such as Philostratus is out to bring to new life forgotten manners and customs. What, then, was the substance of these *patria ethè*, this *mos maiorum*?[11] Certainly not political. When we search both pagan and Christian writers, we encounter issues which lie in the area of manners and morals. Philostratus castigates the Spartans because they now parade themselves in fashionable clothing; Dio Chrysostom praises the people of Rhodes as the last representatives of the old Greek life-style because of ... their appearance, hair-style and solemn gait! Above all it concerns religion. "The highest fruit of piety is to worship God according to the customs of our forefathers"—thus the Neoplatonist Porphyrius (*ad Marcell.* 18). The customs found in different nations, esp. among the Egyptians, might appear rather strange, but they were accepted. With this argument Josephus repeatedly made the typically Jewish aspects of the Mosaic law acceptable.

For the Romans their religion, observed according to the customs and ceremonies of their forefathers, was the power behind the state. The phenomenon is known well enough but needs to be mentioned in this connection. The idea that the greatness of Rome is the fruit of its *pietas* is one which surfaces early in Roman historiography. During the national revival under Augustus this idea was expressed with great emphasis and celebrated by Horace and Virgil—one think, for instance, of the Aeneid. This idea did not vanish, as Moore more or less implies, suddenly to resurface in the 4th century. The words, *Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,* were burned into the soul of Rome, and the maintenance and observance of the national cult was the essential means to this end, the more so as it had proved its validity by success. At times this cult coincided with emperor worship but at other times one is aware of a certain distancing from this. In the *Acta Martyrum* the sacrifice demanded is sometimes to be offered to the emperor, sometimes on his behalf. This is strikingly brought out in the *Acta Cypriani* I and IV: the emperors have commanded that *eos qui Romanam religionem non colunt, debere romanas caeremonias recognoscere*, and the civic leaders add this in addressing the bishop: *diu sacrilega mente vixisti et plurimos nefariae tibi conspirationis homines adgregasti et inimicum te diis romanis et religionibus sacris constituisti* and the emperors have not been able to recall you *ad sectam caeremoniarum suarum.*

At this point we have touched upon the area of conflict between Christianity and Roman nationalism. For from such a point of view there followed a critique of Christians which often had deadly consequences. We see the appearance of this argument for instance in Minucius Felix's *Octavius* ch. 6: it is one's duty to maintain the religion of one's forefathers, and it is because the Roman empire absorbed and continued all the national religions that it has been crowned with glory. These issues are raised with the utmost sharpness by Celsus in his all-out attack on Christianity (end 2nd century). It is well known that much of this is presented in the original in Origen's counter-attack. The argument concerning the traditional customs of the nations is raised in v 25-41. The Jews observe these (even if they are rather strange) as do the other peoples: the differences in their customs probably arose because the nations came under different lawgivers. Celsus then adduces a list of different customs, mainly drawn from Herodotus, which often reappear and probably belong the the stock tradition on this point. It is proper that the Jews should observe their customs but it is improper that others should adopt these. In this respect Judaism scores over Christianity. The religious argument comes to the fore at the end of book VIII: if everyone abandoned the emperor, as the Christians do, he would remain on his own and would no longer be able to resist the barbarians: if, on the other hand, the Romans were to

give up their religion and adopt that of the Christians, that would be of no avail, as the history of the Jews shows only too clearly how little that God helps his people. Celsus considers the possibility that the whole world might one day come under one law as Utopian and strongly urges the Christians to take part in the administration of the state ἕνεκεν σωτηρίας νόμων καὶ εὐσεβείας (*c. Cels.* VIII 75).

What was the Christian reply? In Minucius Felix Roman history itself is used to demonstrate precisely what this customary piety amounted to and the pagan critique is laughed out of court! Origen attempted an extensive reply to Celsus' arguments.

To explain the difference in customs he points to Deut. 32:8 (LXX): "When the Most High divided the nations, when he separated the sons of Adam, he set the bounds of the nations according to the number of the angels of God. And his people Jacob became the portion of the Lord, Israel was the line of his inheritance". This concept, which goes back to the Jewish idea that every nation had a kind of guardian angel, is frequently used by patristic writers[12], sometimes with all the emphasis on the last part "the portion of the Lord" and *ethnè* understood as referring to the pagans (e.g. 1 Clement 29) or sometimes in order—with the aid of the theory about fallen angels—to explain the origin of foolish godless customs, because linked with Genesis 11 this text points to the scattering of the nations as a punishment for sin. Christians have been set free from sin through Jesus Christ and have learned to live according to God's holy law, which is equally valid for all mankind (cf.esp. *c. Cels.* v 37). What is allowed for the philosopher ought not to be denied to the Christian. As for the consequence of religious observance for the state, if everyone would do as the Christians, things would not go wrong: the day will come when the barbarians too will become subject to God's word and obey the Law: the beginnings of that can already be seen because Christendom is spreading day by day. Origen expects that conversion to God is bound to bring protection by the state: if the Jews do not receive this, it is because of their sin. He is convinced of the coming unity of all mankind, for God has promised that one day all will together call upon the name of the Lord. Christians pray for the state—an idea, which one frequently encounters, and the fact that this is prescribed by Paul in 1 Tim. 2, is gratefully used as a proof of integrity (acc. to Tertullian one prays for the state to withstand chaos). In prayer one does battle for one's country and forms good citizens, because they learn to obey God's Law.

Here, then, we have a detailed Christian reply. Sometimes it was formulated more briefly, as by Clement of Alexandria (*Protrept.* x 99): "...custom, which has made you taste bondage and unreasonable care, is fostered by vain opinion; and ignorance, which has proved to the human

race the cause of unlawful rites and delusive shows ... has stamped on all that follow it the mark of long-continued death." For a detailed and exact attack on various customs one could turn to the interesting refutation of astrology in Bardesanes' *Book of the Laws of the Lands.* But the most important frontier did not lie there. Time and again the *Acts of the Martyrs* show that the battle is fought out over the question of belief in God: God the creator of heaven and earth; Christ the Redeemer of all the earth, be it as giver of the law, be it as Logos (the formulation of the apologists tends towards the philosophical language but actually has its roots in the heart of the Christian confession). Salvation is universal: God does not favour certain nations. Here is the 'new people'—*tertium genus.* It is readily pointed out that the birth of the Roman empire coincided in time with the birth of Christ; hence Melito sang the praises of the Roman state (fr. 1, Goodspeed, p. 307-308) and Origen regarded the unity of the Roman empire as God's pre-condition for the successful preaching of the Gospel of peace by the apostles. Where other lawgivers had failed, Christ succeeds: all Greece (here = the civilised world) and the barbarian part of the world contains countless numbers, who have abandoned the laws of their forefathers and fulfil God's law despite persecutions. In the end what was at stake was not a kingdom of this world but the Kingdom of God, which is not of this world. One may read the words of Hermas (*Mand.* I 1-3): "He said to me: 'Thou knowest, thou servant of God, that thou dost live in a foreign land; for thy city is far from this city" (hence one should not desire to acquire property); "for the Lord of this city will say: I do not wish thee to live in my city; get thee hence out of this city, for thou dost not live according to my laws". Thereupon follows an exhortation to live according to God's laws: "do thou thine own task and thou shalt be saved". Herein we find contained that assurance, that distancing from and critique of the world which the earliest Christians felt towards the world and also towards Roman nationalism. The catholic Church, embracing the whole earth—one acknowledges this with pride—awakens man to expect the Kingdom of heaven in its preaching, leads men towards that Kingdom and lives for it. With excited expectancy men looked forward and prepared themselves for the end when God would be King over all. For the prayer of the *Didache* (x 5) continued to flourish in many forms: "Remember, Lord, thy Church, to deliver it from all evil and to make it perfect in thy love, and gather it together in its holiness from the four winds to thy Kingdom which thou hast prepared for it ... let grace come and let this world pass away, Hosanna to the son[13] of David!" This expressed well the whole attitude of the Christendom of the first centuries towards the national powers of that time.

NOTES

* The original of this article is to be found in J. Barents *et al., Christendom en Nationalisme,* 's-Gravenhage 1955, p. 38-54.

[1] J. Huizinga, *Cultuurhistorische Verkenningen,* Haarlem 1930, p. 58.

[2] See *Christendom en Nationalisme* p. 13 & 17.

[3] C. J. Cadoux, *The Early Church and the World,* Edinburgh 1925.

[4] Peterson, 'Das Problem des Internationalismus im alten Christentum' in: *Theologische Zeitschrift* VII, 2 (March - April 1951), p. 81-91, later also published with minor modifications in: *Hochland* XLIV, Felmar 1952, p. 216-223.

[5] In: *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* XLVIII (1917), p. 27-36.

[6] J. Klausner, *Jesus von Nazareth,* 2nd. ed., Berlin 1934, p. 523. Cf. also his *From Jesus to Paul,* London 1945, *passim.*

[7] R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English,* vol. II, Oxford 1913, p. 649f.

[8] H. Fuchs, *Der geistige Widerstand gegen Rom,* Basel 1926.

[9] J. Jüthner, *Hellenen und Barbaren,* Wien 1922.

[10] K. Holl, 'Das Fortleben der Volkssprachen in Kleinasien in nachchristlicher Zeit', in *Gesammelte Aufsätze zur Kirchengeschichte,* Vol. II *Der Osten,* Tübingen 1928, p. 238-248.

[11] On this point cf. *int. al.* Johanna Schmidt, *Ethos, Beiträge zum antiken Wertempfinden,* Borna-Leipzig 1941, p. 35-59 (with literature).

[12] For evidence see Peterson op. cit.

[13] Following the reading of *Constit. Apost.* VII 26, ed. Funk, Paderborn 1905, p. 414. The ms. reads θεῷ which is adopted by most editors of Did. (ed.).

"DIASPORA" AND "CHURCH" IN THE FIRST CENTURIES OF CHRISTIAN HISTORY*

Some years ago Dr. H. Wagenvoort wrote in an address to the old alumni of the University of Utrecht that they were living in the *diaspora*[1]. Would it be too presumptuous to assume that the one, whom we thank and honour with this Festschrift, would readily allow us to regard former students, whose Alma Mater is Leiden, in this way? I think not. For one who day by day surveys that place in the Rapenburg, which to the erstwhile Leidenaar turned the Key Town into Lugdunum Batavorum, must think with sympathy of those whose lot once fell in this good ground but who now, deprived of such privilege, exist somewhere in the bitter cold of our society. He will think of them, scattered as they are to the four corners of the earth and only bound to that shrine of learning by the bonds of memory and nostalgia, as the "dispersed", like those Jews who once lived far from Jerusalem. What is written in these pages will reach his ears as a voice calling from the diaspora.

Yet it was not primarily my past as a student in Leiden that prompted me to write in this festschrift about the relationship between "diaspora" and "church". For the connection between the two concepts adumbrated in the title is a very close one. The question has in fact been asked in the last few years whether *diaspora* does not express a typical characteristic of the Church. In an article about 'Diaspora als Gestalt kirchlichen Seins und kirchlicher Sendung[2], G. Niemeier observes, that there is a Christian diaspora by the very fact that the Church exists, that there has for long been a pastoral concern for Protestant minorities in Roman Catholic areas—one needs to remember here that this particularly refers to Germany[3]—and that one result of the Second World War has been an unprecedented increase of diaspora communities among the floods of refugees. He argues that it is therefore necessary to consider this issue in terms of ecclesiology as well as sociologically. The existence of such communities is not an accident; they are rather living examples of the "real" embodiment of the church in the world: "Ihr Sein ist ihre Sendung, ihr Befragtwerden wie ihr Fragen ist der niemals verstummende Hinweis darauf, dass alle Kirche Diaspora ist und solches an keinem Ort und zu keiner Stunde vergessen darf" (p. 233), because the extraordinary apartness of such a community brings into sharp focus the real questions about the true nature of the church. While Niemeier thus reaches his characterisation of the church as diaspora obviously strongly influenced by the German situation, this view is by no means geographically con-

fined. The issue is raised in a wider context in some recent studies of the place of the laity in the church. H. H. Walz for instance writes: "I have often wondered in recent years whether it has not been a mistake to concentrate the doctrine of the Church so much on its being gathered. I think that the Church will appear to be gathered from the four winds of the earth only at the end of history as we know it. For the time being the Church is not a gathered community, but to use the paradoxical phrase of one of the Reformers, Melanchthon, the community of the dispersed. The laity who work out their worldly calling in all sorts of places most clearly bring this character of the church, this missionary aspect to light[4]. That this is not simply the view of one man, however eminent in the Ecumenical Movement, is shown by the fact that H. R. Weber took over this line of thought in the issue of *Student World* devoted to "The Laity". He goes so far as to call this "New light on the Church". It is usually forgotten, he argues, "that, during the time between Christ's ascension and His return, the Church lives and works mainly as a scattered community. When developing His plan of salvation, God sent Israel in the diaspora. ... In the same way God has been scattering His Church in the world since Acts 7 until the present day"[5]. This scattered community is meant to work like salt. The parallel with the Jewish diaspora in the Hellenistic and Roman world is thus strikingly and clearly drawn; it provides us with the possibility of reading off God's purpose from this. On this view, therefore, the "dispersion" is an essential characteristic of the church, not caused by or bound up with situations of exceptional need but an expression of the very nature of the Ecclesia and thus in fact its normal state, however much this may be forgotten. It is certainly true that this view seldom, if ever, comes to the fore in ecclesiology.

Another vision of the scattering of the church of Christ meets us in our national anthem, the "Wilhelmus", in stanza 14:

> Farewell, my poor sheep,
> who are in direst need;
> your shepherd will not sleep,
> *e'en though you are dispersed.*
> Entrust yourselves to God;
> accept His wholesome word;
> as godly Christians live,
> for soon 't will here be done.

We may properly here disregard the oft-discussed questions about origin and historical background. What is relevant to our theme is that the "dispersion" here is not seen as the normal shape of the Christian Church but rather as a sign of direst need. As is often the case with

hymns from the Reformation period, so we encounter here a number of allusions to Biblical phrases. The passage which most tellingly bears on the motif being studied here is Zech. 13:7 = Matt. 26:31 parr., but surprising and rich in comfort are the words, that the 'shepherd' has not been defeated but wakes. Behind the earthly shepherd looms the figure of the "Shepherd of Israel" (Ps. 80:2), who neither slumbers nor sleeps (Ps. 121:4). Just as in the OT His scattered people is time and again urged to return to the Lord God[6], so this call is addressed to the new Israel. The promise is added that their distress will soon come to an end.

Are we then to understand this "dispersion" as a distress situation for the church or as an essential characteristic of its true nature, at any rate in the period between the ascension and the return of Christ? It is worth investigating how this question was handled in the first period of the Christian church, the more so as the views put forward above make use of biblical motifs. Is *diaspora* used in the earliest Christian writings as a category constitutive of the church? Our theme is therefore not the historical question, whether the Jewish diaspora provided the basis for the expansion of the church, a question which has often been discussed and has received extensive treatment by von Harnack[7], but rather the ecclesiological question, whether "dispersion" is an essential characteristic of the Church.

In a series of brief articles, outline sketches rather than detailed drawings which the author was, alas, not able to develop and complete as they deserved to be, De Zwaan pointed out the great variety of images used to describe the Ecclesia in early Christian literature[8]. *Diaspora* does not receive a mention. Yet there appears to be a widely held view that it is in fact a true description. The following comment on Acts 8:1b appeared in a recent commentary: "the Diaspora or Dispersion of the New Israel, corresponding to that of the Old Israel began, ... "with references to John 7:35, 1 Peter 1:1 and James 1:1[9]. Thus without further ado the parallel with the Jewish diaspora is used for the new People of God on the basis of διεσπάρησαν (cf. Acts 8:4 and 11:19) and this use is assumed to be self-evident. It is a view which will be found in most exegetical comments on the latter two texts[10]. Normally the meaning of the word is reckoned to be metaphorical. The close connection with the concept of "lodging" in 1 Peter 1:1 appears to make this meaning acceptable. It is more or less certain that this letter was addressed to people who had been pagans (4:3 ff.). A typical Jewish term could not be properly used of them. Moreover 1:17 speaks of our earthly life as a time of "sojourning in a foreign land", and 2:11 with its "aliens and lodgers" points to a view of the readers of this letter along much the same lines, that is that Christians are on earth as pilgrims or foreigners because their citizenship is in heaven.

It is clearly true that such a view is widespread in the earliest Christian writings[11]. But does it follow that we may say with Knopf: "... die Gotteskinder wohnen in der finsternen Welt in der Zerstreuung, erst im künftigen Äon werden sie zusammengebracht werden und im Gottesreiche vor Gottes Angesicht wohnen"? Such a transition seems very plausible and has won virtually common consent. Knopf does of course have to concede that the actual word διασπορά is seldom used of Christians though he does refer to James 1:1 and *Didache* IX 4 in order to conclude his argument by pointing to the link with the Old Testament: "...die mancherlei Stellen des A.T. die von Rückkehr und Sammlung der zerstreuten Volksgenossen sprachen, haben die Christen sicher auf ihr eigenes γένος, das wahre geistliche Israel bezogen, so dass ihnen auch von hier aus die Anschauung von διασπορά gelaüfig sein müsste."

It has been worth quoting Knopf extensively because he summarises precisely the sort of arguments which are commonly used[12]. We shall return later to the use of the OT in this chain of thought. To argue from James 1:1 is in any case inadvisable, both because commentators can readily find themselves caught in a *circulus vitiosus* and because this text is itself so opaque and hence capable of various interpretations, that its use as an aid to argument soon has an air of *obscurum per obscurius.* Likewise the reference to the bread of the eucharist in *Didache* IX 4 faces us with a number of exegetical puzzles[13], while the word "diaspora" is simply not there.

One could in support of this view (Diaspora = dispersion in the world) point to Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I 10:1 ἡ μέν ἐκκλησία καίπερ καθ' ὅλης τῆς οἰκουμένης ἕως περάτων τῆς γῆς διεσπαρμένη: this is repeated in par.2: καίπερ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διεσπαρμένη. We must however ask whether we may here be encountering a "technical" use of the word. In *A.H.* III 11:8 we find him using a synonym: κατέσπαρται δὲ ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐπὶ πάσης τῆς γῆς. The thrust of all these texts is Irenaeus' insistence on the catholic, that is the whole earth embracing, nature of the church. The idea of "being aliens" plays no part in this; the contrast is rather between unity in the faith and the wide spread of the church, as seen in the necessity of having four gospels containing the one gospel, because the church is spread across the whole earth to the four corners of the wind. There is no question here of a parallel with the Jewish people. The repeated use of καίπερ does indicate that the contrast is a sharp one evoked by an unexpected situation. That this is the case is demonstrated by his use of διασπείρω (see below p. 102).

A serious argument against the interpretation of 1 Peter 1:1 reproduced above and against the connection of Diaspora with the "New Israel" is the notable fact that there is no support to be found in Origen.

This is all the more remarkable, because this church father is very much given to spiritualising all kinds of OT terms and images and applying them to the Church. In his *Commentary on Genesis* (cited by Eusebius, *H.E.* III 1:2) while discussing the missionary enterprise of the apostles[14], he says that Peter in certain named provinces of Asia Minor κεκηρυχέναι τοῖς ἐν διασπορᾷ Ἰουδαίοις ἔοικεν. The form of the expression makes quite clear that Origen is here not drawing on some independent tradition but bases his knowledge on the introduction of 1 Peter. Eusebius followed him on this exegetical trail: Peter addressed τοῖς ἐξ Ἑβραίων οὖσιν ἐν διασπορᾷ[15]. It is well known that there is considerable controversy over the destination of this epistle: Jewish or pagan Christians? Without exception today's scholars would opt for the latter. Origen and Eusebius clearly thought otherwise; the way in which they use διασπορά shows that the thought conjured up by the word was not that of Jewish Christians but simply that of Jews. This seems to me to be a highly valuable indication of the concepts which this word conveyed to men who were thoroughly versed in the meanings of their own language.

Is theirs an isolated opinion? It should prove useful to look at its use by some other writers from the first Christian centuries. In the so-called Apostolic Fathers there is no trace of its use either in verb or substantive noun form[16]. Among the Apologists the word only occurs in Justin Martyr and then, significantly, in his *Dialogue with Trypho.* In one passage the reference of *Diaspora* is unambiguously to the Jews. In chap. 117 Justin applies the prophecy from Malachi 1:10-12 to the Christian eucharist and goes on to say that Jewish scholars dispute this by arguing that, while the sacrifices of the inhabitants of Jerusalem were not acceptable to God, the prophet meant prayers offered to God διὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ τότε δὴ ὄντων ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ἐκείνου ἀνθρώπων and that these prayers were called "sacrifices" (par. 2). This therefore clearly points to Jews living outside Palestine in the time of Malachi. Justin did not dispute this equation of prayers with sacrifices but maintained that only Christians could be deemed to be offering *pure* sacrifices. In par. 4 he picks up the idea of the *Diaspora* and dismisses it as mistaken[17]: after all the Jews are not to be found in all the world, as there are nations among whom they are not met, whereas there are Christians in every race and nation. He argued further (par. 5) against their interpretation that the Scriptures show that in the time of Malachi οὐδέπω ἡ διασπορὰ ὑμῶν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ ἐν ὅσῃ νῦν γεγόνατε,ἐγεγένητο. We must conclude then that the word is here used of the Jews and in a geographical sense. Justin in no way uses the word about Christians along the lines of: "... but in our diaspora ...". The issues are somewhat different in chapters 113 and 121. In the first of these Justin discusses the wellknown parallel between the names of Joshua and

Jesus. Joshua was the only one of his contemporaries who came out of Egypt to survive and lead the rest of the people into the Promised Land and distribute it; Jesus the Christ τὴν διασπορὰν τοῦ λαοῦ ἐπιστρέψει καὶ διαμεριεῖ τὴν ἀγαθὴν γῆν ἑκάστῳ (par. 3); the difference between Joshua and Jesus is that the former gave them a temporary inheritance, because he was not the Christ nor the Son of God, while Jesus after the holy resurrection grants an eternal possession. What are we to make of the phrase: "Christ will turn again the dispersion of the people"? Is Hort not right in seeing here a reference to Christendom in view of the parallelism in the passage?[18] Before we can answer these questions we shall need to turn to a study of chap. 121, 4. In that chapter Justin shows how the result of Christ's first coming in humility has proved to be the conversion of some in every nation from their wicked ways, so that His name is held in awe; how much greater then will be the impact of His coming again, when He will destroy His enemies and give rest to His own! He continues as follows: "To us, therefore, it has been granted to hear and to understand and to be saved by this Christ and to recognise all that is of the Father. Wherefore He says to Him..."; this then leads into a quotation from Isaiah 49:6[19] which contains the phrase τὰς διασπορὰς τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ ἐπιστρέψαι. This text, which deals with the redemption of the whole world, does not have proselytes but Christians in view. It makes clear that in chapter 113 also we have a quotation which is a highly condensed allusion to the saving work of Christ. He saves both Jew and Gentile; the Jews by removing from them the curse of the dispersion that lay upon them[20]. Here also the reference is not to the church but, as the genitives following διασπορά underline, to Israel.

Nothing can be contributed to our discussion from Clement of Alexandria, as the word is not used by him in a religious context[21]. Hippolytus uses the word in a comment on Genesis 49:7: "I will scatter them in Jacob, I will disperse them in Israel." Jacob/Israel is the Holy firstborn Son of God, ᾧ ἀπειθήσαντες διεσπάρησαν νῦν ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ αἰχμάλωτοι ὑπὸ τῶν ἐχθρῶν γεγενημένοι. The meaning here is clear; it is the punishment to be borne by the Jews because of their rejection of Christ, the loss of their existence as a nation after the fall of Jerusalem[22]. One of the characteristics of the Antichrist mentioned in *de Antichristo* 53-54 is that he will gather the whole nation ἐκ πάσης χώρας τῆς διασπορᾶς and lead them back to Jerusalem in order to reestablish the old Jewish state. This nation is characterised in chap. 56 as the people "who are always disobedient to God". Thus the messianic task of the "gathering in"[23] here acquires a devilish counterfeit. What is again clear is that the *diaspora* refers to that of the Jews.

The connection between "dispersion" and "punishment" is clearly to the fore in Origen. He is certainly aware of a rabbinic interpretation of the 'Man of Sorrows' of Isaiah 53 as the Jewish People καὶ γενομένου ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ καὶ πληγέντος, ἵνα πολλοὶ προσήλυτοι γένωνται τῇ προφάσει τοῦ ἐπεσπάρθαι Ἰουδαίους τοῖς λοιποῖς ἔθνεσι (*Contra Celsum* I 55). We should note the close connection between the 'dispersion' and the calamities: the word is not itself to be found in Is. 53 and is brought in by way of exegesis to refer to the present plight of the people driven from Jerusalem; admittedly the consequence of this is on the basis of Is. 53:10-11 described in terms of drawing in proselytes[24], but this is evidently an afterthought. In his *Hom. in Jer.* XII 3 he uses the verb in commenting on Jer. 13:12 ff. as a synonym for διασκορπίζω; it is punishment for sin. This usage is determined by that of the Septuagint, but that also illustrates to what extent it is loaded with OT meaning[25]. In his commentary on John 11:48 (*In Joh.* XXVIII 12) Origen sees this remark fulfilled in the fall of Jerusalem: ἦραν δὲ καὶ τὸ ἔθνος, ἐκβάλλοντες αὐτοὺς ἀπὸ τοῦ τόπου, καὶ μόγις ἐπιτρέψαντες αὐτοὺς εἶναι ὅπου βούλονται καὶ ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ. Here the word is used in a geographical sense but once again with reference to the dispersion of Israel.

The word has the same connotation for Eusebius. This dispersion, prophesied as a punishment in the OT, is one of the disasters that struck Israel because of their unbelief in Christ after the destruction of Jerusalem. We should note *Dem. Ev.* I 1:7: ὡς εἰς πάντα τὰ ἔθνη καθ' ὅλης οἰκουμένης διεσπαρήσαντο, ὡς οὐκέτ' αὐτοῖς ἡ τῶν κακῶν παῦλα οὐδέ τις ἀνάπνευσις τῶν συμφορῶν ἐλπισθήσεται and its parallel in *Praep. Ev.* I 3:13. The distress did not only lie in subjection to the Gentiles in slavery but also, as the *Syriac Didascalia* 26 rightly pointed out, in the inability in the diaspora situation properly to observe the requirements of the Law[26]. It is incidentally striking that this "Teaching of the Apostles" does not number *diaspora* among its many descriptions of the church but reserves the word for the plight of the Jewish people.

This survey of the use of the word by a number of early church writers demonstrates that the word is never applied to the church, nearly always describes the plight of the Jews after the fall of Jerusalem and in so doing always paints a situation of distress, which is often felt to contain an element of punishment. Διασπείρω does not merely mean "scattering seed" but shattering into scattered pieces. Over against this distress and disaster stands Christ Jesus, come to gather into one; and that is not only the music of an eschatological future but has ever since His coming been realised.

In the light of the undertones of calamity heard in this word the passages from Irenaeus quoted above are thrown into even bolder relief.

He seeks to express the wonder of the fact that the church, though it was so scattered that one might well fear the worst for it, nevertheless preserved the unity of her faith. Interesting too is his observation made in connection with a remark of one of the Presbyters in *A.H.* v 17:4: διὰ τῆς θείας ἐκτάσεως τῶν χειρῶν τοὺς δύο λαοὺς εἰς ἕνα θεὸν συνάγων[27]: δύο μὲν γὰρ αἱ χεῖρες, ὅτι καὶ δύο λαοὶ διεσπαρμένοι εἰς τὰ πέρατα τῆς γῆς... i.e. Jews and Gentiles. But—and this is the thought expressed here—this "dispersion" has been brought to an end by the Cross of Christ.

If after this tour we now return to our starting-point, then we are driven to conclude that it is highly improbable that *diaspora* in 1 Peter 1:1 is meant to describe the Christian Church. If it did, then this text would stand entirely alone (leaving aside the obscure words of James 1:1)[28]. This is not only true of early church usage but also in relation to the use of the OT. We have already seen that Knopf in this respect simply uses the OT as an example for the Christians. But in so doing he totally ignores the fact that there the "dispersion" is always understood as a form of extreme punishment inflicted by God on His people when they disobey Him and forsake His Laws. Yet those addressed in 1 Peter are described as "children of obedience" (2:9); they who were once Not-My-People have become My-People (2:9); the judgement has actually been removed through Christ who brings us to God (3:18; cf. also 2:20 ff.). Precisely because *Diaspora* has such a distinctive colouring and is here linked with a number of geographical names, it seems to me impossible not to translate this phrase as: "those of the Diaspora (of the Jews) who lodge...". For Christians the gathering in had begun with the coming of the promised Messiah and thereby the dispersion had been brought to an end[29].

It is moreover obvious in the light of the Old Testament usage, which has manifestly influenced Christian authors, why *this* description simply could not be used of the church. The phrase, "the diaspora of the New Israel", quoted earlier in this article is a total absurdity. The Christians had to find an entirely different word to express the reality that the church is not bound to one place but spread throughout the world. The word chosen was καθολική[30], which expresses truly both the worldwide interdependence and the unity of the whole in its totality (contrasted with κατὰ μέρη).

One line of thought touched upon in passing has disappeared from sight in the course of our discussion, that is that of the church as "alien" in the world. This is in fact a vitally important aspect of being the church; it deserves and still awaits thorough treatment in a monograph but it must in no way be connected with this "diaspora-concept", which leads in a quite different direction. On the contrary, the concept which needs to

be linked with it is that of the "gathering in": that has several aspects to which existing treatments of early Christian ecclesiology fail to do justice[31].

Our study of the texts inevitably gives this treatise a somewhat negative character: there is no connection between the concepts of "church" and "diaspora", as is often suggested, but only a contradiction. At this point the difference between Judaism and Christianity becomes peculiarly and strikingly clear. Between the two stands Jesus Christ. It is precisely when we clarify what the church is not, that we sense all the more powerfully what she is.

Of course concepts also have their history and can in the course of that history undergo considerable metamorphoses. I would, however, in the light of this treatise question the desirability of working with the *diaspora* terminology in modern ecclesiology. Both according to biblical and early Christian linguistic usage 'dispersion' is definitely not characteristic of the church, let alone the norm of her mode of being. In modern parlance *diaspora* has come to mean "minority group with a spiritual and social structure different from that of the majority". The concept has thus become secularised and has lost its biblical theological character. One cannot object to such a definition; after all *verba valent usu*. But one must object when this concept is then reintroduced into the sphere of theology and used as an apparently biblical concept in the manner outlined at the start of this essay.

The Church is Christ's; that is why she cannot be *diaspora*.

NOTES

* The original text of this article appeared in *Ecclesia* (Festschrift J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink), 's-Gravenhage 1959, p. 33-45.

[1] H. Wagenvoort, 'Aan de Alumni der Utrechtse Universiteit in de Diaspora der kille maatschappij', in: *Post Iucundam Iuventutem*, Febr. 1956.

[2] G. Niemeier, 'Diaspora als Gestalt kirchlichen Seins und kirchlicher Sendung', in: *Evangelische Theologie* VII (1947-1948), p. 226-233.

[3] On this point see F. Lau, 'Diaspora II: Evangelische Diaspora', in: *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*, 3rd edn., Tübingen 1958, II, col. 177-180.

[4] H. H. Walz, 'Adult Christianity', in: *Layman's Work* Nr. 8, Geneva 1955, p. 20.

[5] H. R. Weber, 'The Ministry of the Laity in the Missionary Outreach of the Church', in: *The Student World* XLIX (1956), p. 222ff.

[6] For this and other matters about the place of Diaspora in the OT, which shortage of space merely allows me to allude to, see my work on *Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora* [as yet unpublished, ed.]—The article on Διασπορά by K. L. Schmidt in G. Kittel's *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1935, vol. II, p. 98-104, is inadequate in many respects and presents incorrect interpretations.

[7] A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, 4th edn., Leipzig 1924, I, pp. 5-23.

[8] J. de Zwaan, 'Another Approach to the Idea of the Ecclesia in the New Testament', in: *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* I (1946), p. 15-26 and 'Some Remarks on the 'Church-Idea' in the Second Century' in: *Aux Sources de la tradition chrétienne*, Mélanges-M. Goguel, Neuchâtel-Paris, 1950, p. 270-277.

[9] C. S. C. Williams, *The Acts of the Apostles*, London 1957, p. 114. This approach will be shown to be mistaken in what follows. I have myself provided an exegesis, which does justice to the peculiar character of the *diaspora*, in an article entitled. 'Kruising van eenzaamheid en gemeenschap in het Nieuwe Testament' in: *Vox Theologica* XXVII (1958), p. 81-86 [English translation in *Sparsa Collecta* II, p. 241-247].

[10] John 7:35 "So the Jews said to each other, 'Where does he intend to go, that we should not be able to find him? Surely he is not intending to go to the Dispersion among the Greeks and to teach the Greeks?'' There is no need to discuss this text as it evidently refers to the Jewish Diaspora in Greece and Asia Minor. We should notice in passing that there is an unfavourable undercurrent in the use of 'Dispersion'.

[11] See R. Knopf, *Die Briefe Petri und Judä*, Göttingen 1912, p. 28ff.

[12] I consider it superfluous to parade all the commentaries on this text. The theory that the readers were Jewish Christians has, as far as I am aware, not found any support since B. Weiss and E. Kühl. The question of the force to be given to the genitive διασπορᾶς can only be settled when the prior issue of the meaning of the word has been determined.

[13] On this much discussed passage see H. Riesenfeld, 'Das Brot von den Bergen, zu Did. 9.4', in: *Eranos* LIV (1956), p. 142-150: this is the latest treatment known to me besides that in J. P. Audet's commentary, *La Didachè, Instruction des Apôtres*, Paris 1958.

[14] The text reads: τῶν δὲ ἱερῶν τοῦ σωτῆρος ἡμῶν ἀποστόλων τε καὶ μαθητῶν ἐφ' ἅπασαν κατασπαρέντων τὴν οἰκουμένην κτλ.

[15] Eusebius, *H.E.* III 4:2: καὶ ἐκ τῶν Πέτρου δὲ λέξεων ἐν ὁπόσαις καὶ οὗτος ἐπαρχίαις τοὺς ἐκ περιτομῆς τὸν Χριστὸν εὐαγγελιζόμενος τὸν τῆς καινῆς διαθήκης παρεδίδου λόγον, σαφὲς ἄν εἴη ἀφ' ἧς εἰρήκαμεν ὁμολογουμένης αὐτοῦ ἐπιστολῆς...

[16] I am leaving the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* out of account, though the word frequently occurs there, because the passages in which the word appears are in my view definitely Jewish in origin.

[17] ὅτι δὲ ἑαυτοὺς πλανᾶτε καὶ ὑμεῖς καὶ οἱ διδασκάλοι ὑμῶν, ἐξηγούμενοι ὅτι περὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τοῦ γένους ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ διασπορᾷ ὄντων ἔλεγεν ὁ λόγος.

[18] F. J. A. Hort, *The First Epistle of St. Peter I 1-II 17*, London 1898, p. 16, n. 1.

[19] The second part of this quotation is used in Acts. 13:47, cf. 26:28, as an injunction to preach to the Gentiles.

[20] On the characteristic sense of condemnation associated with the Diaspora see my study on *Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora*, referred to in n. 6.

[21] *Paed.* III 3:19:1.—*Protr.* IX 88:3—*Strom.* VI 2:1.

[22] The Christians are therefore using *diaspora* where the Jews themselves would speak of Galuth = exile. But there does seem to me to be a difference of emphasis between the two concepts.

[23] See P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 2nd edn., Tübingen 1934, p. 344ff.

[24] As far as I know this interpretation appears just once in rabbinic literature, a fact not mentioned either in P. Koetschau's edition of the text or in H. Chadwick's translation; it is to be found in *Bab. Talmud Pesachin* fol. 87b: "Ferner sagte R. Ele'asar: Der Heilige, gepriesen sei er, hat Israel nur deshalb unter die Völker zerstreut, damit Proselyten sich ihnen anschliessen'', but the motivation is different, i.e. found in Hosea 2:25—R. Johanan quoted Hosea 2:3 alongside this (translation by L. Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*, Berlin 1930, II, p. 585ff.)

[25] See also *Peri Euchès* 11:3.

[26] The Greek text is found in the *Apostolic Constitutions* VI 25:1: Διὸ καὶ εἰσὶν ἐπικατάρατοι μὴ δυνάμενοι ποιεῖν τὰ διατεταγμένα. (there then follows a quotation from Gal. 3:10, cf. Deut. 27:26). ἀδύνατον δέ ἐστιν ἐν διασπορᾷ μεταξὺ ἐθνῶν ὄντας πάντα τὰ τοῦ νόμου ἐπιτελεῖν αὐτούς''.

[27] Cf. Paul in Eph. 2; this idea was still of importance in the second century, as is clear from a reading of Justin.

[28] On Acts 8:1 see note 9.

[29] This is not the place to discuss the implications of this point for our understanding of the letter; on that see my article on 'De Verlossing I Petrus 1:18-19 en het probleem van den eersten Petrusbrief' in: *Mededeelingen der Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afdeeling Letterkunde*, N.R., deel 5, no. 1, Amsterdam 1942, p. 90ff., [English translation in *Sparsa Collecta* II p. 3-82 reference here to p. 71ff.].

[30] Cf. J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink, 'Credo sanctam ecclesiam catholicam', in: *Nederlandsch Archief voor Kerkgeschiedenis* XLII (1958), p. 196ff.

[31] As for instance in the books devoted to this theme by G. Bardy: *La Théologie de l'Eglise de saint Clément de Rome à saint Irénée*, Paris 1945, and *La Théologie de l'Eglise de saint Irénée au concile de Nicée*, Paris 1947.

DIE GOTTESLEHRE BEI ARISTIDES UND IN GNOSTISCHEN SCHRIFTEN*

In den Handbüchern der Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte hat sich die Gewohnheit eingebürgert, nacheinander als separate Gruppen die ,,Apostolischen Väter'', die Apologeten und die Gnostiker zu behandeln. Es erübrigt sich, Beispiele anzuführen; die Methode wird fast überall verfolgt. Sie ist jedoch keineswegs empfehlenswert. Erstens wird dadurch der Eindruck geweckt, als ob es sich um eine chronologische Folge handle, während die Tatsache, daß Schriftsteller von allen drei Gruppen *Zeitgenossen* waren, verschleiert wird. Zweitens suggeriert diese Behandlungsweise den Gedanken, daß es sich um geschlossene ,,Schulen'' handelt, die deutlich voneinander getrennt wären, während die Künstlichkeit dieser Trennung nicht zum Bewußtsein kommt. In der Tat verdanken ,,die apostolischen Väter'' ihren Namen einer zufälligen Zusammenstellung im Sammelband des Cotelerius (1672). Sie gehören nicht zu einer Schule und stammen nur ungefähr aus der ersten Hälfte des 2. Jahrhunderts. Ebenfalls bilden die ,,Apologeten'' keine Schule, sondern werden so benannt, weil von diesen Schriftstellern aus den Jahren etwa 125-175 n. Chr., die eine sehr vielseitige Tätigkeit entwickelten, vor allem die Apologien aufbewahrt und bekannt sind[1]. Was die Gnostiker anbelangt, zo waren sie geistig miteinander verwandt, aber eigentlich wurden sie von der antihaeretischen Polemik der Großkirche auf einen Haufen geworfen, während die Ketzerbestreiter doch wissen, daß die ,,Gnosis'' sich in einer Vielheit von Formen offenbarte[2]. Vor allem sollte man bedenken, daß die christlichen Gnostiker in der Zeit vor etwa 180 n. Chr. noch im ziemlich engen Zusammenhang mit der Kirche lebten. Für ein geschichtliches Verständnis des Christentums in Rom um 150 zum Beispeil muß man Hermas, Justin und Valentin zusammenbetrachten. Nur durch Auflockerung der künstlichen Trennungen und eine synchronistische Behandlung wird der großartige Kampf des damaligen Christentums für seine Eigenart ins rechte Licht gerückt.

Diese methodischen Bemerkungen mögen der Besprechung des hier aktuellen Problems vorausgeschickt werden, zumal die Funde von Nag Hammadi[3] das Problem der Entstehung und Entfaltung der ,,Gnosis'' und damit auch das Verhältnis von ,,Gnosis'' und Christentum in eine neue Lage gebracht haben. Es ist wichtig, daß die Probleme in ihren wirklichen Zusammenhängen gesehen werden und daß nicht künstliche Scheidewände den Blick hemmen.

1.

Die älteste uns bewahrt gebliebene christliche Apologie, die des *Aristides*[4], schickt seiner Beschreibung der verschiedenen Religionsformen eine allgemeine Gotteslehre voraus. Obwohl die Überlieferung der Handschriften etwas schwankt[5], ist es für unseren Zweck nicht nötig, alle textlichen Differenzen zu besprechen. Es genügt hier, Geffckens Text wiederzugeben[6]:

> I 4. Ich sage aber, daß Gott (1) unerzeugt, (2) ungemacht ist, (3) ((daß er von niemandem umfaßt wird, sondern selbst alles umfaßt, (4) αὐτογενὲς εἶδος)), (5) ohne Anfang und ohne Ende, (6) ((unvergänglich)), (7) unsterblich, (8) vollkommen und (9) unbegreiflich. (8) Vollkommen aber, wie ich sagte, bedeutet dieses, (10) daß in ihm nicht ein Mangel ist, und (11) nicht ist er irgend eines Dinges bedürftig, aber alles ist seiner Bedürftig. Und was ich sagte, (5) daß er ohne Anfang sei, bedeutet, daß alles, was einen Anfang hat, auch ein Ende hat, und was ein Ende hat ist auflösbar. 5 (12) Einen Namen hat er nicht, denn alles, was einen Namen hat, ist Genosse der Kreatur. (13) Eine Gestalt hat er nicht, (14) auch nicht Zusammensetzung von Gliedern, denn wer dieses besitzt, ist Genosse der geformten (geschaffenen) Dinge. (15) Weder ist er männlich noch weiblich, ((denn in wem solches ist, der wird von Leidenschaften beherrscht)). (16) Der Himmel umfaßt ihn nicht, sondern der Himmel und alles Sichtbare und Unsichtbare sind in ihm befaßt. — (17) Einen Gegner hat er nicht, denn nicht ist jemand da, welcher stärker wäre denn er. (((18) Unbeweglich ist er, (19) unermeßlich und (20) unaussprechlich, denn (21) es gibt keinen Ort, von wo und wohin er bewegt werden könnte; auch wird er nicht mehr als meßbar von irgend einer Seite (22) umgrenzt und (23) umschlossen, denn er ist es, (24) welcher alles erfüllt und alles Sichtbare und Unsichtbare überragt.)) (25) Zorn und Grimm besitzt er nicht, denn nicht ist etwas da, was ihm Widerstand zu leisten vermöchte. (26) Irrtum und Vergessen ist nicht in seiner Natur, denn ganz und gar ist er (27) Weisheit und Erkenntnis. (28) δι' αὐτοῦ δὲ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκεν. (29) ,,οὐ χρῄζει θυσίας καὶ σπονδῆς'',[7] οὐδέ τινος πάντων τῶν φαινομένων, πάντες δὲ αὐτοῦ χρῄζουσιν.

Von den vielen *Parallelen*, die zu dieser Aufzählung der Gottesprädikate gegeben werden können[8], sei nur erwähnt das Fragment des *Kerygma Petri*[9] (Clem. Alex., *Strom.* VI 39:2-3):

ὅτι εἷς θεός ἐστιν, ὃς ἀρχὴν πάντων ἐποίησεν, καὶ τέλους ἐξουσίαν ἔχων, (30) ὁ ἀόρατος, ὃς τὰ πάντα ὁρᾷ, (31) ἀχώρητος, ὃς τὰ πάντα χωρεῖ, (11) ἀνεπιδεής, οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐπιδέεται καὶ δι' ὃν ἐστιν, (32) ἀκατάληπτος, (33) ἀέναος, (6) ἄφθαρτος, (34) ἀποίητος, ὃς τὰ πάντα ἐποίησεν λόγῳ δυνάμεως αὐτοῦ.

Obwohl viele von diesen Prädikaten auch bei anderen Apologeten vorkommen, stehen sie dort nicht in einem so deutlichen Zusammenhang wie hier. Bei Aristides fällt es auch auf, daß er nicht nur eine Kette von Adjektiven oder antithetischen Prädikaten gibt, sondern daß er auch regelmäßig eine Art von ,,Begründung'' hinzufügt.

2.

Neben diese schon längst gesammelten und besprochenen Ausführungen der Apologeten können jetzt noch zwei „Beschreibungen" des höchsten Gottes aus jüngst veröffentlichten *gnostischen* Quellen gestellt werden. Sie finden sich in dem *Apocryphon Johannis* und der *Sophia Jesu Christi*, welche von Walter Till aus dem Berliner gnostischen Papyrus 8502 herausgegeben sind[10]. Die Übereinstimmungen mit Aristides werden im folgenden durch Kursivierung hervorgehoben; die Ziffern weisen auf Aristides und das Kerygma Petri hin.

A) *Apocryphon Johannis* (ed. Till, S. 85ff.):

Über den Geist (?), da er eine μοναρχία ist, herrscht niemand (cf. 17). Der wahre Gott, der Vater des Alls[11], der heilige Geist, der (30) *Unsichtbare*, (24) der *über dem All ist*, der *in seiner* (6) *Unvergänglichkeit* besteht, er ist im reinen Licht[12], in das kein Augenlicht zu blicken vermag. Man darf ihn, den Geist, sich nicht als Gott vorstellen, oder daß er in einer bestimmten Weise geartet ist. Denn er ist vorzüglicher als die Götter. Eine ἀρχή, über die niemand herrscht (ἄρχειν), ist er[13]. Denn niemand (oder: nichts) existierte vor ihm[14], *noch* (11) *bedarf er ihrer*. Er braucht kein Leben, denn er ist (34) *ewig*. Er braucht nichts, denn er ist unvollendbar, da er gar nicht nötig hatte, daß er vollendet werde, sondern jederzeit ganz (8) *Vollendung* ist. Licht ist er[15]. (22) *Unbegrenzbar* ist er, weil niemand vor ihm ist, um ihn zu begrenzen. Er ist der Unbeurteilbare, weil niemand vor ihm ist, um ihn zu beurteilen. Er ist der (19) *Unermeßliche*, weil kein anderer, der vor ihm existiert hätte, ihn ermessen hat. Er ist der (30) *Unsichtbare*, weil ihn niemand sah. Er ist der (33) *Ewige*, der immer ist. Er ist der Unbeschreibliche, weil ihn *niemand erfaßt* hat (32), um ihn zu beschreiben. Er ist der, *dessen* (12) *Namen man nicht sagen kann*, weil es niemanden gibt, der vor ihm war, um ihn zu benennen[16]. Er ist das unermeßliche Licht, die heilige, lautere Reinheit, der Unbeschreibliche, Volkommene, Unvergängliche[17]. Er ist nicht Vollendung noch Seligkeit, noch auch Göttlichkeit, sondern er ist etwas, was weit vorzüglicher als das ist. Er ist auch nicht unendlich, noch wurde er begrenzt, sondern er ist etwas, was vorzüglicher als das ist. Er ist nicht körperlich, noch ist er körperlos; er ist nicht groß und ist nicht klein; er hat keine meßbare Größe, *kein Geschöpf* (2) und *niemand kann ihn begreifen* (9). Überhaupt nichts, was existiert, sondern etwas, was vorzüglicher als das ist, ist er. Nicht alsob er an sich vorzüglich wäre, sondern weil er sein Eigenes ist, hat er nicht teil an einem Äon, denn an dem, der an einem Äon teil hat, haben andere *bereitet* (oder: geformt) (cf. 2). Und Zeit wurde ihm nicht zugeteilt, da er von keinem anderen, der zuteilt, etwas erhält. Und (11) *er braucht auch nichts*. Es gibt überhaupt niemanden vor ihm. Er, der nur nach sich selbst verlangt in der Vollendung des Lichts, begreift das lautere Licht. Die unermeßliche Größe,
der Ewige, der Ewigkeitsspender,
das Licht, der Lichtspender,
das Leben, der Lebensspender,
der Selige, der Spender der Seligkeit,
die Erkenntnis (27), der Erkenntnisspender,

der jederzeit Gute, der Gutes Spendende,
der Gutes Tuende, was nicht so beschaffen ist, weil es hat,
sondern weil es gibt;
das erbarmende Erbarmen;
die Gnade, die Gnade spendet,
das unermeßliche Licht.

B) *Sophia Jesu Christi* (ed. Till, S. 209ff.):

Jener (= Gott) ist ja (7) *unsterblich* und (33) *ewig*, und zwar ein Ewiger, (1) *der keine Geburt* hat. Denn jener, der eine Geburt hat, wird auch untergehen (cf. Begründung von 5). Der *Geburtslose* aber hat *keinen Anfang; denn jeder, der einen Anfang hat, hat auch ein Ende* (5). Und niemand herrscht über ihn[19]. Er hat *keinen Namen* (12); denn wer einen Namen hat, ist das Geschöpf eines anderen[20]. Er ist ein Unbenannter (oder: Unnennbarer[21]). Er hat (13) *keine* menschliche *Gestalt*, denn wer eine menschliche Gestalt hat, ist das Geschöpf eines anderen. Er hat (4) *ein Aussehen* (oder: Wesen), *das nur ihm allein eigen ist...*[22]. (23) *Grenzenlos* ist er. (6) *Unvergänglich* ist er, (16) *unverfaßbar* ist er. Und er ist einer, der dauernd besteht, und es gibt keinen, der ihm gleicht. Er ist gut und verändert sich nicht[23]. Er ist makellos[24], er ist (33) *ewig*, er ist selig, er ist (9) *unbegreiflich*, er allein begreift sich selbst. Er ist (19) *unermeßlich*, er ist unergründlich, er ist (8) *vollkommen*, ohne Makel, er ist selig und fleckenlos. Er wird ,,der Vater des Alls''[25] genannt... Dieser ist ganz Verstand (νοῦς), er ist Erwägung (ἐνθύμησις), er ist (2) *Überlegung* (ἔννοια) *und Weisheit*, er ist Denken und Kraft.

H. Ch. Puech hat richtig den Anfang im *Apocryphon Johannis* (= *Ap. Joh.*) als ,,negative, apophatische Theologie'' charakterisiert[26]. Aber eine Vergleichung dieser Texte erlaubt uns mehr zu sagen:

1) Es zeigen sich zwischen der Gotteslehre des Aristides und der der Gnostiker bis auf den Wortlaut starke Übereinstimmungen. Aristides nimmt zwischen den Apologeten eine eigene Stelle ein, weil er seine Gotteslehre als ein ziemlich geschlossenes Ganzes seinen weiteren Darlegungen vorausschickt. Das ist bei den anderen Apologeten nicht der Fall, denn sie bieten die Elemente ihrer Gotteslehre mehr zerstreut dar. Deshalb gibt Aristides die Gelegenheit zu einer nützlichen Vergleichung, und auch wo er keine Parallele zeigt, kann man diese bei anderen wie zum Beispiel Justin finden[27].

2) Die Vertreter des Gnostizismus stehen mit ihrer Beschreibung des höchsten Gottes also nicht allein, sondern teilen ihre Anschauungen mit einem Mann, dessen Orthodoxie nicht angezweifelt wird. Dabei ist es merkwürdig, daß Irenaeus in seiner Parallele zu *Ap. Joh.* in *Adv. haer.* I 29 diese Gotteslehre nicht wiedergibt. Wenn Carl Schmidt seinerzeit zu Recht behauptete, daß Irenaeus das *Ap. Joh.* exzerpiert hat[28], so läßt sich fragen, ob er nicht bewußt diesen Passus fortgelassen hat, der seinem Zwecke nicht dienlich war, weil die Gotteslehre hier weitgehend mit der der Großkirche übereinstimmte und keinen Anlaß zum Angriff gab.

3) Es fällt weiter auf, daß in dieser Partie die *Sophia Jesu Christi* (= *SJC*), welche vom Herausgeber später als das *Ap. Joh.* datiert wird[29], dem Aristides näher steht als das *Ap. Joh.* Im letzterwähnten Buch wird das Lichtsein Gottes stark unterstrichen, was sich in den beiden anderen Texten nicht findet und wohl ein später hinzugefügtes Element darstellt. Der fast hymnische Ausgang paßt auch nicht ganz zum Vorhergehenden; seine Aussagen über Gott scheinen aus einer anderen Sphäre zu stammen[30], denn es ist nicht mehr die Sprache der philosophischen Schule, sondern die der Liturgie. Ferner ist im *Ap. Joh.* eine bestimmte Wiederholung ohne wesentlichen Fortschritt des Gedankens, wie man das in späteren Entwicklungen gnostischer Schriften des öfteren wahrnimmt, unverkennbar. *SJC* ist auch durch das wiederholte Begründen der Aussagen mit Aristides verbunden (oben S. 107). *Ap. Joh.* steht aber mit seiner Akzentuierung der ,,Vorzüglichkeit'' vereinzelt da. Deshalb scheint es mir eher, daß *SJC* ein etwas älteres Stadium in der Wiedergabe der Gotteslehre repräsentiert.

3.

Wie soll man sich nun das *Verwandtschaftsverhältnis* zwischen Aristides einerseits, den gnostischen Schriften anderseits vorstellen?

Eine direkte Beeinflüssung in die eine oder andere Richtung ist wohl ausgeschlossen. Nirgendwo zeigt Aristides gnostische Gedanken und hat, wie noch ausgeführt werden soll (unten S. 000), eben in seiner Gotteslehre eine bestimmt anti-gnostische Spitze. Auf der anderen Seite finden sich auch keine Spuren von einer Entlehnung durch die Gnostiker. Aus einem Vergleich ergibt sich, daß es sich hier nicht um direkte Zitate handelt, sondern um Übereinstimmungen im Wortgebrauch, wobei aber die Begriffe nicht in der gleichen Reihenfolge vorkommen.

Erst recht ausgeschlossen scheint mir die Möglichkeit einer Entlehnung durch folgende Tatsache. *SJC* ist wie gesagt in seiner Beschreibung des höchsten Gottes von *Ap. Joh.* nicht abhängig; die Schrift steht vielmehr Aristides nahe. Nun sagt *SJC* (bei Till, S. 201), daß vom Anfang der Welt an die Menschen zu ergründen suchten, ,,wer Gott ist und welcher Art er ist. Sie haben ihn nicht ergründet (wörtlich: gefunden). Die Weisesten aber unter ihnen stellten aus der Lenkung der Welt und der Bewegung eine Vermutung auf. Ihre Vermutung aber traf die Wahrheit nicht''; nur durch die unmittelbare Offenbarung des Erlösers, der aus dem unendlichen Licht gekommen ist, wird Gott gekannt (S. 203ff.). Dann folgt die oben wiedergegebene Beschreibung. *SJC* weist hier expressis verbis die Methode (griechischer) Philosophen ab, aber diese wurde auch von Aristides, wie aus dem Anfang von Kapitel I hervorgeht[31],

befolgt. Auch im *Ap. Joh.* beruht die Gotteslehre auf Offenbarung, die von Jesus Christus gegeben wird.

Die Gnostiker haben die Gotteslehre also nicht bei Aristides gelesen; und Aristides seinerseits stellt eine allgemein angenommene Gotteslehre auf, um einen Ausgangspunkt für seine Darlegungen zu haben, beruft sich aber nicht auf eine spezielle Offenbarung und sicher nicht auf eine ,,gnostische''.

Nun wäre es natürlich an sich auch möglich, daß sowohl der Apologet als die Gnostiker unabhängig voneinander aus derselben Quelle geschöpft hatten, nämlich aus der hellenistischen Religionsphilosophie, eventuell in ihrer jüdisch-hellenistischen Form. Bei der Erklärung von Aristides hat man, wie vorher gesagt (Anm. 8), darauf hingewiesen. Das mag wohl für den Apologeten zutreffen[32], aber es stimmt nicht für die offenbarungsgläubigen Gnostiker (*SJC* ist vollends abweisend)[33].

Dann bleibt nur die Möglichkeit, daß das Mittelglied in der *christlichen Unterweisung* gesucht wird. Das kann man sich in dieser Weise vorstellen. In den Schulen der christlichen Gebildeten, wie wir sie zum Beispiel bei Justin kennen[34], wurde wahrscheinlich zu apologetischen Zwecken gelehrt, die Christen hätten in ihrem Gott den Höchsten gefunden, von dem die Heiden gesprochen und nach dem sie gesucht hatten (siehe Anm. 32). Von anderen Christen, die diesen philosophischen Hintergrund nicht kannten, wurde nicht die Identität von dem Gott der Bibel und dem der philosophischen Sprache betont, sondern der Unterschied. Die Gottesprädikate der philosophischen Sprache wurden Aussagen einer höheren Form des Christentums, und deshalb kann man sie, wie in *Ap. Joh.* und *SJC*, als die höchste *christliche* Offenbarung predigen. Dies ist allerdings eine hypothetische Rekonstruktion der Vorgänge, aber eine, die die Tatsachen zu erklären vermag.

In dieser Weise wird nämlich die Übereinstimmung im Wortschatz erklärt. Ebenso versteht man, weshalb die Gotteslehre im Rahmen dieser ,,Theologien'' an verschiedenen Stellen erscheint. Bei Aristides steht sie am Anfang, um für die christliche Offenbarung den Weg frei zu machen; bei den Gnostikern ist sie die eigentliche Offenbarung. Dazu kommt noch die entscheidende Differenz: bei Aristides ist dieser erhabene Gott der Schöpfer der Erde[35], bei den Gnostikern ist der Gott, der so durch überwiegend negative Attribute umschrieben wird, die Negation dieser Welt und hat gar nichts damit zu tun. Bei aller Übereinstimmung im Wortgebrauch entsteht so eine ganz andere Heilslehre; auf diese kommt es dem Gnostiker an. Die kirchlichen Theologen haben begriffen, welche schwerwiegende Folgen die Scheidung zwischen dem Höchsten Gott und dem Schöpfer hatte. Eben dieser Unterschied, der allmählich deutlicher hervortritt, beleuchtet die Übereinstimmung, die hier berührt worden ist.

Die erwähnten Zusammenhänge und Unterschiede werden nicht sichtbar, wenn man Apologeten und Gnostiker des 2. Jahrhunderts gesondert behandelt, weil sie nicht zu derselben „Gruppe" gehören und andere literarische „Formen" verwenden. Nur wenn man sie zusammen betrachtet als Menschen, die Christen sein wollten und die Wahrheit des Christentums zu bezeugen begehrten, entdeckt man die positiven und negativen Beziehungen.

ANMERKUNGEN

* Erschienen in: *Theologische Zeitschrift* 17 (1961), S. 166-174.

[1] Wenn man die Aufzählung der Schriften beachtet, welche Eusebius in seiner Kirchengeschichte von Justin (IV 11:8-10; 18:1-6), Tatian (IV 26:6-7) und Melito (IV 26:2-14) gibt, dann kann man doch schwerlich dabei beharren, daß diese Männer *nur* Verteidiger des Christentums waren.

[2] Cf. Iren. *Adv. haer.* I 28:1; Hipp. *Ref.* V 11.

[3] Darüber im allgemeinen W. C. van Unnik, *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand*, 1959.

[4] B. Altaner, *Patrologie*[5], 1959, S. 94f. (unter Hadrian).

[5] In dem griechischen Text, der im Roman von «Barlaam und Joasaph» verarbeitet ist, und in den syrischen und armenischen Versionen.

[6] J. Geffcken, *Zwei griechische Apologeten*, 1907, S. 4f.

[7] *Or. Sibyll.* VIII, 390.

[8] Eine ausführliche Liste hat seinerzeit E. Hennecke, *Die Apologie des Aristides*, 1893, S. 52f., gegeben; sie könnte noch vermehrt werden. Ausführlich darüber auch Geffcken (A. 6). Diese Parallelen finden sich nicht nur bei den anderen christlichen Apologeten, sondern vor allem auch in heidnisch-griechischen Quellen.

[9] Diese Parallele ist schon in der ersten Veröffentlichung der Apologie von J. Rendel Harris vermerkt, *The Apology of Aristides*[2], 1893, S. 87. — Altaner (A. 4), S. 61, setzt die Schrift im ersten Drittel des 2. Jahrhunderts an.

[10] W. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, 1955.

[11] Πατὴρ τῶν ὅλων kommt bei Justin oft vor und wird von ihm selbst in die Taufformel eingefügt (*Apol.* 61:3). Wie bekannt, stammt die Verbindung aus Platons *Timaeus* 28, wo sie (ganz ungnostisch) mit dem Prädikat „Schöpfer" ergänzt ist. In der philosophischen Gotteslehre war der Ausdruck gang und gäbe.

[12] Cf. 1 Tim. 6:16.

[13] Just., *Dial.* 60:5: ὑπὲρ ὃν ἄλλος οὐκ ἔστι.

[14] Gott ist bei Justin ἀγέννητος; E. R. Goodenough, *The Theology of Justin Martyr*, 1923, S. 128ff.; das ganze Kapitel über die Gotteslehre (ch. IV) ist von Bedeutung.

[15] Cf. 1 Joh. 1:5. Es erübrigt sich, Belege für die Verbreitung dieses Gedankens anzuführen; Literatur bei R. Schnackenburg, *Die Johannesbriefe*, 1953, z. St.

[16] Goodenough (A. 14), S. 130f.

[17] Diese Prädikate sind nur Wiederholung des Vorigen.

[19] Vgl. A. 13.

[20] Goodenough (A. 14), S. 130: "Justin deduces God's *namelessness* as a corollary from the fact that He is unbegotten".

[21] Nur Wiederholung.

[22] Hier steht ein Zwischensatz, der die Fremdartigkeit des Aussehens noch einmal unterstreicht.

[23] Vgl. Just., *Apol.* 13:4.

[24] Jesus heißt in Just., *Dial.* 17:3 τοῦ μόνου ἀμώμου καὶ δικαίου φωτός. Aber als Epitheton Gottes habe ich es in der ältesten christlichen Literatur nicht finden können.

[25] Vgl. A. 11. Hier ist ein merkwürdiger Gegensatz zu dem, was vorher über die Namenlosigkeit Gottes gesagt worden ist; es zeigt m. E., wie verschiedene Traditionen zusammengeworfen sind und wie fest diese Bezeichnung ,,Vater des Alls'' war. Zudem konnte sie bei den Gnostikern eine sehr spezielle Interpretation bekommen.

[26] H. C. Puech, in: E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*[3], 1959, S. 236.

[27] Auch im *Evangelium Veritatis* finden sich manche Parallelen zu diesen Gottesprädikaten, aber sie sind dort nicht zusammenhängend als eine Einheit gegeben, und deshalb lohnte sich in unserem Zusammenhang ein Vergleich nicht.

[28] C. Schmidt, 'Irenaeus und seine Quelle in adv. haer. I, 29, in: *Philothesia. Paul Kleinert zum LXX. Geburtstag dargebracht*, 1907, S. 315ff.

[29] Till (A. 10), S. 36.

[30] Positive Prädikate erscheinen hier anstatt der negativen. Es würde sich wahrscheinlich lohnen, dieses Stück in Verbindung mit liturgischen Formeln zu studieren.

[31] Arist. *Ap.* I, 2 (Geffcken, S. 3): ''Und daß ich forschen solle hinsichtlich seiner, der dieser Beweger von allem ist...''

[32] Allerdings ist dies nur der Anfang; zu berücksichtigen ist auch XV 3 (Geffcken, S. 23): ,,Die Christen aber, o König, da sie umhergingen und suchten, haben die Wahrheit gefunden. Und wie wir aus ihren Schriften entnommen haben, sind sie der Wahrheit und der genauen Erkenntnis nahe, mehr denn die übrigen Völker''. Die ,,natürliche Theologie'' genügt nicht, um Gott zu finden; den wahren Gottesdienst lernt man nur durch die Schriften der Christen, XVI 3.

[33] Einfluß des Judentums scheint mir fast ausgeschlossen, vgl. meinen Aufsatz, 'Die jüdische Komponente in der Entstehung der Gnosis': *Vig. Christ.* (1961) [In diesem Band, S. 199ff.].

[34] *Acta Justini* 3; Eus. *Hist.* IV, 11:8.

[35] Arist., *Ap.* I 3 (Geffcken, S. 4): ''Ich sage aber über den Beweger der Welt, daß er der Gott von allem ist, welcher alles wegen des Menschen gemacht hat'', cf. auch XV 3: γιγνώσκουσι γὰρ τὸν θεὸν κτίστην καὶ δημιουργὸν τῶν ἁπάνων.

DER AUSDRUCK ,,IN DEN LETZTEN ZEITEN'' BEI IRENAEUS*

Es wird nicht wundernehmen, wenn wir in dieser Festschrift dem Verfasser von ,,Christus und die Zeit'' einen Beitrag zum Geschichtsverständnis in der alten Kirche widmen. Noch immer fehlt eine umfassende Behandlung der Frage, wie die Christen in den ersten Jahrhunderten die Geschichte im Lichte der Offenbarung Jesu Christi erlebt haben, m.a.W. eine dogmenhistorische Fortführung von Cullmann's neutestamentlicher Arbeit[1]. Nicht nur für die Auseinandersetzung mit der ,,heidnischen'' Geschichtsbetrachtung und Weltanschauung in verschiedenster Ausprägung, mit der (christlichen) Gnosis, sondern auch für die innerchristliche Entwicklung von Dogmatik, Ethik und Liturgik ist das ein sehr bedeutsames Thema; denn es behandelt nicht ein zufällig ausgewähltes Element, sondern zeichnet den Rahmen, in dem das Ganze sich abspielt. Eine Teilfrage dieses grossen Problemkreises möchten wir hier besprechen, nämlich: welche Bedeutung hat Irenäus den Worten ἔσχατοι καιροί = *novissima tempora*, die er ziemlich oft gebraucht, beigemessen?

In seinem grossen Buch, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, sagt Martin Werner, dass der Gedanke, Jesus sei ein Phänomen der anbrechenden Endzeit, in den Schriften der nachapostolischen Zeit deutlich nachklingt. ,,Noch während Jahrhunderte ist davon die Rede, dass Christus 'in den letzten Zeiten' erschienen sei''; er verweist dafür auf den Hebräerbrief, den 1 Petrus und Symbolformen des Ostens (seit Origenes). Das war nach Werners Meinung jedoch nur ein verbaler Anschluss, denn er fügt hinzu: (diese Formulierung) *,,liess sich freilich nur konservieren um den Preis einer Umdeutung, die den ursprünglichen eschatologischen Sinn beseitigte''*[2]. Zum Beweise führt er Euseb an. Aus dieser Sachlage heraus erklärt er auch das Aufkommen der Rätselfrage, weshalb der Erlöser so spät gekommen ist, welche schon vor der Zeit des Euseb, bei Origenes und Irenäus gefunden wird.

Dieser Abschnitt steht am Anfang eines Kapitels über den ,,Ausklang des eschatologischen Grundgedankens der urchristlichen Naherwartung''. Werner versucht dann den ,,Abbau der urchristlichen Fundamentallehren infolge der Parusieverzögerung'' zu beweisen. Die angeführten Worte stehen nicht an einem beliebigen Punkt in der Beweisführung, sondern sie bilden den Ausgangspunkt. Die Frage nach der Bedeutung der Formel: ,,in den letzten Zeiten'' ist hier also von sehr wesentlicher Art.

In solch einer wichtigen Sache lässt sich die Frage nicht unterdrücken, ob hier der Tatbestand richtig wiedergegeben ist. Zweifel melden sich an, wenn man sieht, wie schnell Werner von den Spätschriften des NT zu Euseb im 4. Jahrhundert hinüberspringt. Gilt seine Auffassung der Bedeutungsentleerung auch schon z.B. für Irenäus, der in seinen Schriften die Formel mehr als dreissigmal gebraucht? Es ist doch möglich, dass die Sache sich bei ihm anders verhält als bei dem Bischof von Cäsarea. In einem bestimmten Falle, nämlich bei der Frage der Geistesgaben, die doch in der altchristlichen Zeit eng mit der Eschatologie verbunden sind, zeigt Euseb selber, dass es einen Unterschied zwischen der Zeit des Irenäus und seiner eigenen gab[3]. Es lohnt sich jedenfalls, den Sachverhalt bei dem Bischof von Lyon zu prüfen, bevor man solch eine weitgehende Behauptung macht.

Zu den Ausführungen Werners lässt sich fragen, ob wirklich die ,,Rätselfrage" ein Beweis dafür ist, dass bei Irenäus die Formel schon bedeutungslos geworden ist. In welchem Kontext Euseb sie bespricht, kann hier unerörtert bleiben. Aber bei Irenäus scheint es mir ganz klar, dass sie auftaucht, eben weil der Ausdruck noch nicht seines Sinnes beraubt war. Irenäus führt in *Adv. Haer.* I 10:3 aus, dass es in der Kirche Leute gibt, die tiefer in die Wahrheit eingeführt sind als andere, ohne das Fundament der kirchlichen Lehre zu verlassen, natürlich im Gegensatz zu den Spekulationen der gnostischen Führer. U.a. erörtern sie auch die Frage ,,warum die Ankunft des Sohnes Gottes in den letzten Zeiten stattfindet, d.h. der Anfang am Ende erscheint"[4]. Die Frage lautet nicht, weshalb der Sohn Gottes *so spät* in der Geschichte gekommen ist, sondern weshalb er *in den letzten Zeiten* gekommen ist. Die hinzugefügte Erklärung mit dem ,,am Ende" (ἐν τῷ τέλει) zeigt deutlich, dass es sich um eine eschatologische Sache handelt. Daraus geht klar hervor, dass ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν καιρῶν nicht mit dem zukünftigen Gerichtstag verbunden ist, sondern mit der schon in der Geschichte liegenden Lebenszeit Jesu, denn der ganze Zusammenhang macht es klar, dass παρουσία hier, wie oft in der altchristlichen Literatur[5], das (erste) Kommen Jesu bezeichnet[6]. Dass diese Verbindung der Formel ,,in den letzten Tagen" mit dem Leben des inkarnierten Jesus keine zufällige Verknüpfung ist, sondern die gewöhnliche Auffassung des Irenäus wiedergibt, zeigen auch viele andere Stellen, die im Laufe unserer Besprechung angeführt werden. Jedenfalls stellen wir hier schon fest, dass die Formel auch für Irenäus eschatologische Bedeutung hatte.

In seinem inhaltsreichen Buch über die irenäische Theologie ,,Heilsgeschichte und Heilswissen" hat Bengsch auf diese Verbindung zwischen dem irdischen Leben Jesu und den ,,novissima tempora" hingewiesen und auch einige andere Stellen angeführt, wo der Ausdruck sich findet[7].

Da er die Formel in ihrer Bedeutung jedoch nicht speziell besprochen hat und deshalb auch einige mit ihr zusammenhängende Fragen unbesprochen bleiben, scheint es mir nicht unangebracht, diesen Terminus in seiner Anwendung bei Irenäus etwas näher zu betrachten.

Irenäus gebraucht den Ausdruck ,,novissima tempora''[8] ziemlich oft, sowohl in *A.H.* als in der *Epideixis*. Dabei fällt es auf, dass er ihn nicht irgendwo speziell besprochen hat; er verwendet ihn als einen geläufigen Terminus in seiner Polemik und Argumentation, am meisten in den drei letzten Büchern seiner Ketzerbestreitung, also in der positiven Darlegung, nicht in seinem Referat der gnostischen Lehren. Daraus kann man natürlich nicht schliessen, dass die Gnostiker ihn nicht gebrauchten, sondern nur dass der Ausdruck in der kirchlichen Lehre so bekannt war, dass er keiner näheren Explizierung bedürfte.

Nur an einer einzigen Stelle zeigt sich, dass die Gnostiker den Terminus auch gebraucht haben. In *A.H.* I 8:2 schreibt Irenäus: ,,was sie (die Gnostiker) aber für die äussern Vorgänge des Pleromas aus den Schriften sich anzueignen versuchen, ist folgendes: Der Herr ist *in den letzten Zeiten* der Welt in sein Leiden geraten, um das über die letzten Äonen gekommene Leiden anzuzeigen, und durch sein Ende zu offenbaren das Ende des Schicksals der Äonen''. Dieser Text ist in verschiedener Hinsicht interessant. Er zeigt deutlich die gnostische Schriftverwendung, die historische Geschehnisse in metaphysische Prozesse umdeutete. Irenäus führt dieses Beispiel der Umdeutung am Anfang einer Reihe von solchen Interpretationen an. Diese Aussage der Gnostiker kommt also nicht aus ihrem System, sondern aus der Hl. Schrift. Das Merkwürdige ist hier, dass man hier jedoch nicht wie bei den anderen Beispielen ein direktes Schriftzitat angeben kann! Deshalb muss man schliessen, dass die Aussage: ,,Der Herr ist in den letzten Zeiten der Welt in sein Leiden geraten'' eine so feststehende Zusammenfassung der christlichen Lehre gewesen sei, dass sie auch von den Gnostikern übernommen und fast als Schriftzitat betrachtet wurde[9]. Es muss deshalb wohl eine ziemlich alte Formel gewesen sein, die in der Kirche umlief. Inhaltlich sei dazu bemerkt, das hier also der Ausdruck ,,die letzten Zeiten'' nicht in die Zukunft verweist, sondern die Zeit angibt, in der Jesus gelitten hat (ἐληλυθέναι ἐπὶ τὸ πάθος — Perfektum!).

Wenn wir von den ,,novissima'' sprechen, denken wir an die Zukunft, an das Ende entweder der Welt oder eines Individuums. Bei Irenäus wird die individuelle Auffassung nicht gefunden, die der Welteschatologie nur an zwei Stellen deutlich, nämlich *A.H.* IV 36:3: nachdem Jesusworte wie Luk. 16:34f., 12:35f., 17:26ff. angeführt sind, folgt: ,,Womit er verkündet, dass ein und derselbe Herr zu den Zeiten des Noa wegen des Ungehorsams der Menschen die Sintflut kommen liess .... und *am*

Ende der Welt (*in novissimo*) wegen eben desselben Ungehorsams und ähnlicher Sünden den Tag des Gerichts wird kommen lassen", und *A.H.* v 26:1 „Noch deutlicher (als Daniel) wies Johannes, der Schüler des Herrn, in der Apokalypse auf *das Ende der Zeiten* (*de novissimo tempore*) mit seinen zehn Königen hin, an die das jetzt herrschende Imperium verteilt werden soll"[10]. Es will beachtet werden, dass Irenäus an diesen beiden Stellen den Singular gebraucht, während er anderswo den Plural verwendet (s.u.). Dieser Singular bezeichnet m.E. die entscheidende Phase der viel breiteren Endzeit.

Von eminenter Bedeutung für die Interpretation der Formel ist *A.H.* IV praef. 4: „Als damals (bei der Verführung Evas) der böse Geist durch die Schlange den Ungehorsam der Menschen bewirkte, glaubte er sich vor Gott verbergen zu können ... *Jetzt* aber, weil es *die letzten Zeiten* sind (*quoniam novissima sunt tempora*), dehnt sich das Übel auf die Menschen weiter aus: nicht nur abtrünnig macht sie der Teufel, sondern durch viele Kunstgriffe, d.h. durch all die vorgenannten Häretiker, bringt er sie sogar zur Lästerung gegen ihren Schöpfer". Hier werden in einer bei Irenäus üblichen Weise Urzeit und Endzeit einander gegenübergestellt. Die fragliche Wendung erinnert an 1 Joh. 2:18, eine *A.H.* III 16:6 wörtlich zitierte Stelle, ist aber keine direkte Entlehnung, weil der Wortlaut verschieden ist. Bedeutsam ist hier das damit verbundene „Jetzt". Die eigene Zeit des Irenäus ist die letzte, weil sich darin Apostasie und Gotteslästerung offenbaren. Obwohl er dabei keine neutestamentlichen Texte anführt, darf man doch wohl denken an 1 Tim. 4:1 „Der Geist sagt aber ausdrücklich, dass in späteren Zeiten (ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς) etliche vom Glauben abfallen und auf irreführende Geister und auf Lehren von Dämonen achten werden" und Judas 18: „Am Ende der Zeit wird es Spötter geben", wie die Apostel vorhergesagt haben[11]. Diese angekündigte Zeit ist in den Tagen, die Irenäus in der gnostischen Krise und im Existenzkampf der Kirche erlebt, erfüllt worden. Das eschatologische Futurum ist Präsens geworden. Hier zeigt sich deutlich, dass die Formel „novissima tempora" nicht umgedeutet ist, sondern ihre eschatologische Kraft bewahrt hat, welche durch das „nunc" seine existentielle Schärfe bekommt.

Diese die Häresie offenbarenden „novissima tempora" sind für Irenäus noch anderweitig charakterisiert. Das kann gezeigt werden, wenn wir danach fragen, wann diese Zeiten begonnen haben. Die Antwort auf diese Frage ist nicht zweifelhaft. Vielmals wiederholt Irenäus den Gedanken, dem wir schon oben begegneten, dass das Kommen Jesu in die Welt die Zeitenwende gewesen ist. Es klingt fast wie ein Bekenntnis, wenn Irenäus *A.H.* IV 35:5 sagt: „wir wissen, dass es nun einen Gott gibt, der die Propheten gesandt, der das Volk aus Ägypten herausgeführt, der *in den*

jüngsten Zeiten (*in novissimis temporibus*) seinen Sohn geoffenbart hat, um die Ungläubigen zuschanden zu machen und die Frucht der Gerechtigkeit zu holen'' oder *A.H.* IV 41:4 über Paulus, der ,,gelehrt hat, dass ein und derselbe Gott Vater, der zu Abraham gesprochen hat, auch das Gesetz gab, die Propheten vorausschickte, seinen Sohn *in den letzten Zeiten* (*novissimis temporibus*) sandte und seinem Geschöpf, das aus Fleisch besteht, das Heil schenkt''[12].

In den letzten Zeiten ist das Schöpfungswort in Jesus Christus inkarniert, wie *A.H.* V 18:3 gesagt wird: ,,der wahre Weltenschöpfer ist das Wort Gottes, d.h. unser Herr, der *in den letzten Zeiten* Mensch geworden ist. Obwohl er in der Welt ist, umfasst er in unsichtbarer Weise alles, was gemacht ist ... und deshalb kam er in sichtbarer Weise und wurde Fleisch und hing am Holze, um alles in sich zu rekapitulieren''[13]. Das Auftreten der berühmten irenäischen Rekapitulationslehre[14], die in diesem Zusammenhang nicht besprochen zu werden braucht, zeigt deutlich, dass es sich um die endgültige, eschatologische Tatsache handelt, dass somit ,,die letzten Zeiten'', in denen sich das alles abgespielt hat, eschatologisch gemeint sind. Das geht auch hervor aus der Auslegung des Gleichnisses Matth. 20:1ff. in *A.H.* IV 36:7, wo Irenäus über die Auszahlung, die bei den letzten Arbeitern beginnt, sagt: ,,Deswegen begann er auch bei den letzten mit der Austeilung des Lohnes, da sich der Herr *in den letzten Zeiten* offenbarte und allen sich vorstellte''. Die hier gebrauchte Wendung ἐπ' ἐσχάτων καιρῶν φανερωθείς erinnert an 1 Petr. 1:20 (φανερωθέντος ἐπ' ἐσχάτου τῶν χρόνων), ist aber kein Zitat (der Wortlaut stimmt nicht überein; der Zusammenhang ist anders); dieser Petrustext wird nirgends von Irenäus angeführt, obwohl er diesen Brief als petrinisch anerkennt. Irenäus drückt sich in der kirchlichen Formelsprache aus, verwendet sie aber selbständig. Aus dem Zusammenhang mit Matth. 20:8 geht hervor, dass die Worte ,,in den letzten Zeiten'' in ihrer vollen Bedeutung gebraucht sind und nicht umgedeutet wurden.

In diesen letzten Zeiten erfüllt sich, was im A.T. prophetisch angekündigt ist. Anknüpfend an Joh. 8:56 sagt Irenäus: ,,Das sagte er aber nicht bloss wegen Abraham, sondern um anzuzeigen, dass alle, die von Anfang an Gott erkannt und die Ankunft Christi verkündet haben (*prophetaverunt*), die Offenbarung von dem Sohne selbst empfingen, der *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) sichtbar und leidensfähig geworden ist und mit dem menschlichen Geschlecht gesprochen hat, um aus den Steinen Abraham Kinder zu erwecken'' (*A.H.* IV 7:1)[15]. In der Wiederspiegelung von Urzeit und Endzeit sieht man, was das Verbum Incarnatum gebracht hat: *A.H.* V 15:4 ,,vielmehr hat der, welcher im Anfang den Adam bildete, und zu dem der Vater sprach: ,,Lasset uns den Menschen machen nach unserem Bild und Gleichnis'', auch *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in*

novissimis temporibus) sich selbst geoffenbart, indem er den, welcher seit Adam her blind war, das Gesicht gab[16]. Darauf weist die Schrift prophetisch hin (*significans quod futurum erat*), indem sie sagt, dass nachdem Adam wegen seines Ungehorsams sich versteckt hatte, der Herr am Abend zu ihm kam, ihn rief und zu ihm sprach: ,,Wo bist du?''. Das bedeutet, dass *in den letzten Zeiten* dasselbe Wort Gottes kam, um den Menschen zu sich zu rufen und ihm seine Werke vorzuhalten, derentwegen er sich vor dem Herrn verborgen hatte. Wie nämlich damals Gott am Abend Adam suchte und zu ihm kam, so suchte er *in den letzten Zeiten* durch dieselbe Stimme sein Geschlecht auf''[17].

,,In diesen letzten Zeiten'' hat Jesus Christus sein Heilswerk getan. In diesem Zusammenhang ist es natürlich unnötig, den *modus quo* der Heilsordnung darzustellen. Einige Texte werden genügen um zu zeigen, wie stark die Erlösung unter dem Vorzeichen dieses Zeittermins steht. *A.H.* IV 24:1 fasst Irenäus Paulus' Lehre an die Heiden zusammen und sagt, der Apostel habe gelehrt, Gott den Schöpfer zu verehren und ,,dass sein Sohn das Wort sei, durch welches er alles erschaffen hat, dass dieser *in der letzten Zeit* (*in novissimo tempore*) Mensch unter den Menschen geworden sei, das Menschengeschlecht erneut und den Feind des Menschengeschlechts niedergeworfen und besiegt habe und seinem Geschöpfe den Sieg gegen seinen Widersacher geschenkt habe''[18]. Dieser Gedanke wird von Irenäus nicht generell, abstrakt formuliert. Er bekommt eine persönliche Note, wie *A.H.* IV 22:1: ,,*In den letzten Zeiten* aber, da die Fülle der Zeit der Freiheit kam (*in novissimis autem temporibus, cum venit plenitudo temporis libertatis*), wusch das Wort persönlich den Schmutz der Töchter Sions ab (Jes. 4), indem es mit eigenen Händen seinen Jüngern die Füsse wusch (Joh. 13:5). Denn das ist das Ende des menschlichen Geschlechtes, das Gott zum Erbe hat, dass wie im Anfang wir durch die ersten Menschen alle in die Knechtschaft gebracht wurden durch die Schuld des Todes, so jetzt am *Ende der Zeit* (*in ultimo*) durch den letzten Menschen, alle, die von Anfange an seine Schüler waren, gereinigt und abgewaschen von der Todesschuld, in das Leben Gottes eintreten'' oder *A.H.* V 17:1: ,,Seine Feinde sind wir geworden, indem wir sein Gebot übertraten. Und deswegen brachte der Herr uns *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) durch seine Menschwerdung in die Freundschaft mit ihm zurück, indem er ,,der Mittler zwischen Gott und den Menschen'' (1 Tim. 2:5) wurde''[19].

Die letzten Zeiten haben somit mit dem Kommen und Werk Christi begonnen: seitdem ist der eschatologische Umschwung im Gange. Das ist nicht eine allgemeine Wahrheit, sondern gilt ,,uns''. Es ist ein historischer Prozess, der sich z.B. manifestiert in der Verbindung von Juden und Heiden in der *einen* Kirche[20]. Das zeigt sich vor allem in den

Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes. Dieser war von den Propheten angekündigt[21] und ist jetzt wirksam in den Gläubigen als ein Merkmal der letzten Zeiten[22]. Das ist wieder von Irenäus nicht futuristisch-eschatologisch gemeint, denn der Geist ist schon nach Apg. 2 ausgegossen. Er ist präsent da und Irenäus und seine Zeitgenossen haben die Wirkungen gespürt[23]. Deshalb bekämpft er auch Leute, die das Evangelium Johannis verwarfen, wahrscheinlich aus anti-montanistischen Ansichten[24]. ,,Andere wieder wollen das Geschenk des Geistes ausser Geltung setzen, das *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) über das Menschengeschlecht nach dem Wohlgefallen des Vaters ausgegossen wurde'' und deshalb verwerfen sie das Evangelium, in dem der Paraklet verheissen wurde (*A.H.* III 11:9). Diese Reaktion des Irenäus zeigt deutlich, wie stark er von dieser Realität des endzeitlichen Geistes in seiner Zeit überzeugt war.

Zusammenfassend dürfen wir sagen, dass nach der Auffassung von Irenäus die Endzeit, im AT versprochen, im Kommen und Wirken Jesu und in der Anwesenheit des hl. Geistes angebrochen ist und in seiner Zeit ungebrochen fortdauert bis zum kommenden definitiven Ende. Das Kommen Jesu ist die grosse Zäsur. Es liegt hier ein Zusammenhang vor mit der für Irenäus so wichtigen Lehre des alten und neuen Bundes.

Wir haben in den vorangehenden Seiten den Kirchenvater in seinen eigenen Formulierungen zu Worte kommen lassen[25], damit man sehen kann, in welchen Zusammenhängen er von ,,den letzten Zeiten'' spricht. Dabei wird deutlich geworden sein, dass der Ausdruck

a) sehr oft gebraucht wird und zum festen Bestand des irenäischen Sprachschatzes gehört;
b) die Zeitauffassung des Irenäus bedingt und in verschiedenen Kontexten verwendet wird;
c) obwohl in einem festen Aufriss der Geschichte stehend, doch nicht in formelhaften Wendungen, in bekenntnisartigen Aussagen vorkommt;
d) seinen eschatologischen Inhalt nicht verloren hat und anzeigt, dass die eschatologische Situation durch das Leben und in dem Leben Jesu angefangen hat;
e) seine Kraft nicht verloren hat durch Umdeutung oder Versteinerung; die rund 150 Jahre, die seit dem Leben Jesu verflossen sind, hindern nicht daran, die ganze Zeit als ,,die letzten Tage'' zu bezeichnen.

Natürlich erhebt sich dabei die Frage, woher Irenäus diesen Ausdruck hatte. Es ist klar, dass er ihn nicht selber geschaffen hat. Obwohl Erinne-

rungen an neutestamentliche Texte vorliegen, verwendet er die Formel auch manchmal in ganz eigenen Wendungen. Wie die Schreiber des NT Hebr. 1:2,1 Petr. 2:19, und die ,,Apostolischen Väter'' (2 Klemens 14:2; Barnabas 4:9, 6:13, 16:5; Didache 16:2, 3; Hermas, *Sim.* IX 12, 3) hat Irenäus diese Wortverbindung der kirchlichen Sprache entlehnt; er verweist dabei selber auf die alttestamentlichen Prophetien als Ursprung. Dabei bemerkt man einen Unterschied in der Formulierung: Irenäus spricht, im Gegensatz zum biblischen Sprachgebrauch und zu den anderen Autoren, die ἡμέρα haben, von καιρός (es ist jedoch nicht möglich, hier absolut gewiss zu sein, da wir in den meisten Stellen bei Irenäus auf Übersetzungen angewiesen sind). In wieweit hier ein terminologisches Problem vorliegt, kann in diesem Zusammenhang nicht untersucht werden[26]; Irenäus scheint hier keinen Unterschied gespürt zu haben, denn er spricht niemals darüber und verweist auf das AT.

Im heissen Kampf mit der Gnosis, welche die Geschichte aufhob, vertritt Irenäus die altkirchliche Heilsgeschichte[27]. Auf dieser Linie kämpft er und unterstreicht je und je, dass die letzten Zeiten, von denen die alttestamentlichen Propheten gesprochen haben, sich seit Jesus Christus erfüllt haben und dass die Kirche in diesen letzten Zeiten lebt.

Dabei ist es bemerkenswert, dass Irenäus so positiv spricht und den Ausdruck selbst nicht in der einen oder anderen Weise zu erklären oder zu verteidigen hat. M.a.W. man spürt in seinen ausführlichen Auseinandersetzungen nirgends Kritik an der Formel. Das scheint mir sehr wichtig und in den Diskussionen über die Parusieverzögerung oftmals übersehen. Wenn diese wirklich solch ein Problem gewesen wäre, wie manchmal behauptet wird, dann hätte es sich an diesem Punkte zeigen müssen. Die Schwierigkeit, die hier vorzuliegen scheint, hat das älteste Christentum nicht nur mit einer speziellen Zeitrechnung, auf die Werner richtig hinweist[28], sondern vor allem durch die Erfahrung der Anwesenheit des hl. Geistes ,,gelöst''. Auch in dieser Hinsicht ist Irenäus ein Fortführer des NT.

ANMERKUNGEN

* Erschienen in: *Neotestamentica et Patristica. Eine Freundesgabe Herrn Professor Dr. Oscar Cullmann zu seinem 60. Geburtstag überreicht*, Leiden 1962, S. 293-304.

[1] R. L. P. Milburn, *Early Christian Interpretation of History*, London 1954, hat nun einen Teil der Fragen behandelt.

[2] M. Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, Bern-Leipzig 1941, S. 83-84 (Kursivdruck von mir). — Etwas weiter in demselben Zusammenhang sagt er: ,,Die ursprüngliche Auffassung, wonach der Christus, d.h. der Messias seinem eigentlichen Wesen nach eine Erscheinung der Endzeit ist, ist völlig verschwunden'' (von Werner gesperrt!).

[3] Cf. Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* v 7 mit Zitaten aus Irenäus.

[4] Übersetzung von E. Klebba, *Des heiligen Irenäus Fünf Bücher gegen die Häresien*, Kempten-München 1912. — παρουσία ist hier deutlich nicht von der Wiederkunft, sondern von der Inkarnation gebraucht; s. auch in der Erklärung ἐφάνη.

[5] P. L. Schoonheim, *Een semasiologisch onderzoek van Parousia*, Aalten 1956 (Diss. Utrecht), S. 51ff.

[6] In *A.H.* I 10:1 gebraucht Irenäus παρουσία von der Wiederkunft, wie aus dem Zusammenhang hervorgeht; diese Schwankung in der Bedeutung ist in den ersten Jahrhunderten üblich, wie das von Schoonheim gesammelte Material beweist.

[7] A. Bengsch, *Heilsgeschichte und Heilswissen, eine Untersuchung zur Struktur und Entfaltung des theologischen Denkens im Werk „adversus Haereses" des hl. Irenäus von Lyon*, Leipzig 1957, S. 81 und Register s.v. Zeit.

[8] Da die meisten Stellen nur in der lateinischen Übersetzung bewahrt sind, behalten wir die lateinische Wortverbindung bei. — In der Kapiteleinteilung bin ich Stierens Ausgabe gefolgt.

[9] Oder aber müssen wir mit einem Wort aus einer verlorenen Apostelschrift rechnen? Irenäus hat auch in *A.H.* I 20:2 ein Agraphon zusammen mit anderen Evangelienzitaten angeführt, ohne das zu bemerken oder daran Anstoss zu nehmen.

[10] Nicht hierher gehört *A.H.* III 23:7, wo von dem Werk Jesu die Rede ist, obwohl z.B. F. Sagnard, *Irénée de Lyon Contre les Héresies* livre III, Paris 1952, z. St. futurisch übersetzt.

[11] Vgl. auch Matth. 24:24ff.; 2 Tim. 3:1, 4:3; 2 Petr. 3:3.

[12] Vgl. daneben *A.H.* II 4:2: „Und wenn der Allgütige *am Ende der Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) sich der Menschen erbarmt und ihnen die Vollkommenheit verleiht, dann hätte er sich doch zuerst derer erbarmen müssen, die den Menschen gemacht haben", — gegen die gnostische Scheidung zwischen Gott und Schöpfer.

[13] Derselbe Gedanke *A.H.* IV 20:4 spricht über das Schöpfungswort: „Das ist aber sein Wort, unser Herr Jesus Christus, der *in den letzten Zeiten* unter Menschen geworden ist, um das Ende mit dem Anfang zu verbinden, d.h. den Menschen mit Gott" — III 17:4 „Wir haben somit klar bewiesen, dass das Wort, welches im Anfang bei Gott war, und durch welches alles gemacht worden ist, und das immer bei dem menschlichen Geschlechte weilte, jetzt *in den letzten Zeiten* gemäss der vom Vater bestimmten Zeit mit seinem Geschöpf sich vereinte und zum leidensfähigen Menschen geworden ist."

[14] Cf. auch *A.H.* IV 38:1: „deswegen kam unser Herr *in den letzten Zeiten* (ἐπ' ἐσχάτων τῶν καιρῶν), indem er alles in sich rekapitulierte".

[15] Cf. auch *A.H.* IV 34:3: „Woher aber hätten die Propheten die Ankunft des Königs und die von ihm verliehene Freiheit voraussagen (praeevangelizare) können und all das, was Christus tat und lehrte und wirkte und litt, und den neuen Bund verkünden, wenn sie von einem anderen Gott die prophetische Inspiration empfangen hätten, wenn sie den unaussprechlichen Vater nicht gekannt hätten, wie ihr sagt, und seine Anordnungen, die der Sohn Gottes bei seiner Ankunft *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimo dierum*) auf der Erde ausgeführt hat.... Wäre das nämlich bei einem der Alten eingetroffen, dann hätte er denen, welche später kamen, doch nicht gesagt, dass das *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) sein werde". — *A.H.* IV 25:1 bei Abraham ging der Glaube der Beschneidung voran: „und wiederum ist er *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) in dem Menschengeschlechte durch die Ankunft des Herrn aufgegangen".... 2 das Leiden des Gerechten. Es wurde im Voraus dargestellt in Abel, beschrieben von den Propheten und vollzogen *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) an dem Sohne Gottes."

[16] Anspielung auf Genesungsgeschichten von Blinden, wie Joh. 9.

[17] Vgl. auch *A.H.* IV 34:4: anschliessend an Jes. 2:3f. — Micha 4:2f. „Das aber ist unser Herr, und in ihm wird das Wort wahr: „Wer den Pflug gemacht, hat auch die Sichel aufgebracht", d.h. das Wort, welches die erste Menschensaat machte, d.h. die Erschaffung Adams, der sammelt auch *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) die Frucht."

[18] Vgl. auch *A.H.* III 11:15 Jesus gab irdischen Wein und Brot und zeigte damit, dass der Schöpfer „hier auch die gesegnete Speise und den gnadenvollen Trunk *in den letzten Zeiten* durch seinen Sohn dem Menschengeschlechte schenkt".

[19] Vgl. auch *A.H.* IV 10:2 mit Verweisung auf Deut. 28:66 und 32:6: ,,Wiederum tat er kund, dass das Wort, das im Anfang schuf und sie machte, *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) uns erlösen und beleben wird''. — *A.H.* IV 38:1 ,,Und deswegen kam unser Herr *in den letzten Zeiten*, indem er alles in sich rekapitulierte, zu uns, nicht wie er selber hätte können, sondern wie wir ihn zu sehen vermochten.'' — *A.H.* V 15:2 ,,Wir sollten erkennen, dass die Hand Gottes, welche uns im Anfang erschaffen hat, auch im Mutterleibe schafft, ebenso uns Verlorene *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) aufgesucht hat, indem sie ihr verlorenes Schaf wiedergewann''.

[20] *A.H.* III 5:3 ,,Als dieser Haupteckstein (jetzt) *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) erscheinend, sammelte und vereinigte er alle von nah und fern, d.h. Beschneidung und Vorhaut'', cf. Eph. 2. — Das war ein bedeutendes Thema in der Theologie dieser Zeit, wie aus *A.H.* I 10:3 hervorgeht.

[21] *A.H.* III 17:1: ,,Denn diesen (Hl. Geist) *in den jüngsten Tagen* (*in novissimis temporibus*) über seine Knechte und Mägde auszugiessen, damit sie prophezeien sollten, das hatte er durch die Propheten versprochen'', vgl. Joel 3:1ff., hier mit deutlichem Einfluss von Apg. 2:17, denn dort ist ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις in den Joel-Text eingefügt.

[22] *A.H.* IV 33:15: ,,der geistige Mensch'' ,,erkennt immer denselben Geist Gottes, wenn er auch *in den letzten Zeiten* (*in novissimis temporibus*) auf neue Art auf uns ausgegossen ist, so doch von Erschaffung der Welt bis zu ihrem Ende auf dasselbe Menschengeschlecht''.

[23] S. *A.H.* II 32:5 und H. Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus*, Freiburg i. Br. 1899.

[24] Vgl. B. H. Streeter, *The Four Gospels*, London 1924, S. 438ff.

[25] Der Ausdruck findet sich auch noch in *A.H.* II 25:1; IV 20:9; V 12:2; *Epideixis* K. 6, 8, 21, 22, 30, 88, 89 (hier: ,,wie er durch die Propheten verheissen hat, den Geist *in den letzten Tagen* über die Oberfläche der Erde auszugiessen''). Diese Stellen sind hier der Vollständigkeit wegen aufgeführt, aber nicht wörtlich zitiert, weil sie keine neuen Gesichtspunkte bieten.

[26] Vgl. G. Kittel-G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, Stuttgart 1932ff., s.vv. ἔσχατος, ἡμέρα und καιρός.

[27] O. Cullmann, *Christus und die Zeit*, Zollikon-Zürich 1946, S. 48f.

[28] M. Werner, *a.a.O.*, S. 84ff.; vgl. auch H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, Tübingen 1920, S. 385f.

LE NOMBRE DES ÉLUS DANS LA PREMIÈRE ÉPÎTRE DE CLÉMENT*

La longue épître de l'Eglise de Rome à celle de Corinthe, qui nous est parvenue sous le nom de *Ia Clementis*, nous montre clairement quelles idées furent généralement répandues parmi les Chrétiens appartenant à un certain groupe de l'Eglise à la fin du Ier siècle. Cependant, en reconstruisant cette doctrine dogmatique et morale, il ne suffit pas tout simplement de collectionner et de coordonner les opinions de l'auteur qui attirent l'attention dès la première lecture. Il faut tenir compte du fait que la *Ia Clementis* a le même caractère que d'autres documents de la même période qui furent rédigés en vue d'une occasion spéciale. La rédaction autant que la suite des idées furent déterminées par la situation dans laquelle l'auteur parlait et qu'il voulait améliorer. La fréquence des mots ne prouve rien pour leur importance. Pour nous, il importe de connaître non seulement la situation, mais aussi l'arrière-plan et les devants du tableau. La dogmatique de la lettre est loin d'être complète: ce à quoi elle vise, c'est à restaurer la communion des fidèles qui avait été brisée. Clément supposait connues bien des choses qu'il ne fait que mentionner en passant. Cependant, on aurait tort d'en conclure que ces choses manquaient d'intérêt.

Pour illustrer ces pensées, prenons comme point de départ un passage concret, c'est-à-dire la mention de Clément[1] du nombre des élus. Cette notion se rencontre plusieurs fois sans que l'auteur juge nécessaire d'en donner une explication. On la trouve entre autres dans le passage où il est question de la prière et qui, sans transition, passe à la célèbre prière des fidèles à la fin de l'épître (ch. 59 ss.). Comme l'a fait remarquer Lowther Clarke, cette expression faisait partie de la tradition liturgique de Clément[2]. Mais cela ne prouve aucunement que cette expression fût une métaphore vidée de sens. Au contraire, le contexte montre clairement, comme nous le verrons par la suite, que l'auteur n'était pas sans savoir pourquoi il employait cette expression. Au cours de l'histoire de l'Eglise, il arrive que la tradition liturgique aboutisse à une théologie obscure, mais ce développement n'est pas inévitable et ce ne fut certainement pas le cas dans cette période où «une abondante effusion de l'Esprit-Saint s'était répandue sur tous» (2:2). Dans son commentaire, Knopf fit observer que l'expression rend un son de prédestination («prädestinatianisch»), mais est en contradiction avec le caractère moral de toute la lettre[3]. Ici l'on pourrait se demander s'il suffit de constater le contraste. Ne convient-il pas de se demander quelle pourrait être l'explication de

cette contradiction apparente? En tout cas, l'auteur se sert de l'expression non pas comme d'une phrase pieuse, mais dans un contexte où elle garde toute sa signification.

La première fois, on rencontre l'expression au commencement de la lettre dans le long passage 1:2—3:1, où l'auteur décrit la prospérité spirituelle de la communauté chrétienne à Corinthe avant les querelles néfastes. Jusqu'alors, les Chrétiens avaient vécu d'après les commandements de Dieu. L'un des éléments essentiels de cette description est le suivant: ἀγὼν ἦν ὑμῖν ἡμέρας τε καὶ νυκτὸς ὑπὲρ πάσης τῆς ἀδελφότητος εἰς τὸ σῴζεσθαι μετ' ἐλέους καὶ συνειδήσεως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ (2:4).

Bien que les commentateurs ne discutent guère ce texte, il me paraît un des plus obscurs de toute la lettre. La question se pose de savoir comment il faut interpréter ces paroles, avec lesquelles on pourrait s'engager dans des voies diamétralement opposées:

a) Il est possible d'interpréter ἀγών comme «lutte, effort». Dans ce cas, l'auteur ferait l'éloge des Corinthiens parce qu'ils travaillaient nuit et jour au profit de leurs frères en Jésus-Christ[4] dans le monde entier. Mais alors, la signification de la deuxième partie de la phrase reste obscure (εἰς τὸ σῴζεσθαι κτλ.) Est-ce que cela voulait dire qu'ils s'efforçaient de sauver le nombre des élus? Les autres endroits où Clément accepte le «agonistischer Topos», comme dit Fischer[5], n'apportent aucune lumière sur cette matière. Cependant, il n'y a pas σῴζειν, mais σῴζεσθαι. L'objection principale est constituée par le fait qu'on ne parle pas «des élus» tout court, pas non plus «des élus de Dieu», mais de «*Ses* élus». Le pronom possessif doit se rapporter à Dieu; il est évident que la difficulté consiste dans le fait que dans le texte le mot «Dieu» ne figure pas, bien que Dieu fût nommé dans la phrase précédente 2:3. Mais ce texte ne parle pas d'effort humain, mais de prière.

b) En rapport avec l'emploi de ἀγών dans saint Paul[6], ce mot peut être interprété dans le sens de prière ardente. Dans ce cas-là, ce texte parle de l'intercession continue qui supplie pour le salut des élus de Dieu. Ici, le mot αὐτοῦ a un sens précis; le lien avec le verset 2:3 est évident: à la prière pour les péchés personnels se joint l'intercession; dans ses rapports avec Dieu, l'homme ne s'occupe pas uniquement de lui-même, mais se souvient également de ses frères.

Abstraction faite du choix qu'on devra faire par rapport à la tendance générale de ce texte, il reste encore quelques questions: 1) quelle est la signification de σῴζεσθαι? Est-ce que c'est un *infinitivus medii* (s'est sauvé) ou un *infinitivus passivi* (est sauvé)? 2) s'il faut regarder σῴζεσθαι comme un passif, qui pourrait être l'agent? La réponse dépend de l'interprétation de ἀγών: si on le traduit par «effort», ce sont les hommes qui «sauvent»; traduit-on le mot au contraire par «prière», alors on supplie Dieu

de sauver; 3) quelle est la signification de μετ' ἐλέους καὶ συνειδήσεως? Les variantes dans la tradition manuscrite sont de peu d'importance pour l'exégèse[7]. Il est clair que μετά exprime la circonstance qui accompagne[8], l'emploi étant très fréquent dans *1a Clementis*. La difficulté est constituée uniquement par la combinaison de ces deux substantifs, parfaitement clairs quand on les prend séparément. Ἔλεος est partout ailleurs où la lettre cite le mot, une qualité de Dieu; συνείδησις au contraire une qualité de l'homme[9]; quel rapport peut-il y avoir entre ces deux mots et quelle est leur signification?

A propos de ce texte surgissent toutes sortes de questions que les commentaires ne parviennent pas à éclaircir. Le reste de la lettre pourra-t-il nous aider à élucider le problème?

Un passage d'une importance capitale à ce sujet me paraît 59:2 où figure la même expression «nombre des élus». Le contexte offre quelques indications intéressantes. En 59:1, l'auteur met en garde ses lecteurs contre les grands risques que courent ceux qui sont désobéissants aux commandements de la lettre, donnés par Dieu par l'intermédiaire de l'auteur. Lui, par contre, sait qu'il est innocent et parle de la prière continuelle: ὅπως τὸν ἀριθμὸν τὸν κατηριθμημένον τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ ἐν ὅλῳ τῷ κόσμῳ διαφυλάξῃ ἄθραυστον ὁ δημιουργὸς τῶν ἁπάντων διὰ τοῦ ἠγαπημένου παιδὸς αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. Au paragraphe 3, il passe tout à coup sans transition à l'apostrophe directe, cessant de parler de Dieu pour s'adresser directement à Lui.

Il est donc évident qu'ici il s'agit d'une prière. La toile de fond de ce passage est la querelle à Corinthe, contre laquelle cette lettre s'oppose (cf. 63:2 περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμονοίας). Ceux qui sont désobéissants aux commandements de Dieu — c'est là la quintessence de la lettre — rompent l'unité du peuple de Dieu, tandis que ceux qui sont obéissants ne cessent de prier. Or, on s'attendrait à ce que le but de cette prière soit l'unité telle que Clément l'a décrite. Mais la description en est différente, à savoir que le Créateur gardera intact le nombre déterminé de Ses élus par Jésus-Christ.

L'apposition κατηριθμημένον qui suit le mot «nombre» est importante: le nombre est déterminé, mais on ne distingue pas l'individualité de ceux qui en font partie; d'autre part, il est clair que chacun court le risque de cesser d'y appartenir.

Y a-t-il une relation entre le contenu de cette prière et les paroles de 2:4? A mon avis, il ne saurait y avoir aucun doute, l'interprétation de σῴζεσθαι par ἄθραυστον διαφυλάττειν n'étant sûrement pas une exégèse forcée. Cette interprétation de σῴζειν (non dans la signification de «assurer le salut», mais dans celle de «garder intact») est connue de Clément, comme le prouve 37:5: πάντα συνπνεῖ καὶ ὑποταγῇ μιᾷ χρῆται εἰς τὸ σῴζεσθαι

ὅλον τὸ σῶμα (= garder intact), ce qui se rapportait directement à la situation de l'Eglise en 38:1: σῳζέσθω οὖν ἡμῶν ὅλον τὸ σῶμα ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ καὶ ὑποτασσέσθω ἕκαστος τῷ πλησίον αὐτοῦ[10]. Faisons observer aussi les paroles dont l'auteur se sert en parlant de la prière ἐκτενῆ τὴν δέησιν καὶ ἱκεσίαν ποιούμενοι témoignant d'une grande pénétration (à comparer ἱκεσία avec 2:3: ἱκετεύοντες).

On pourrait donc prendre 59:2 pour une paraphrase de 2:4 et il s'ensuivrait que ce dernier texte doive être considéré comme une prière. Le choix de l'interprétation *b*) (p. 125) a été dicté par l'auteur lui-même. On pourra croire avec Clarke que l'expression faisait partie de la langue de la liturgie, bien qu'on n'en fasse pas mention explicitement.

A plusieurs reprises, on se réfère à 58:2, où il est également question d'un nombre. L'auteur recommande à ses lecteurs de suivre son conseil. Il dit en se servant d'un serment[11]: ὁ ποιήσας ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ μετ' ἐκτενοῦς ἐπιεικείας ἀμεταμελήτως τὰ ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ δεδομένα δικαιώματα καὶ προστάγματα (c'était là précisément ce dont il s'agissait dans toute la lettre), οὗτος ἐντεταγμένος καὶ ἐλλόγιμος ἔσται εἰς τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σῳζομένων διὰ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ. La rédaction n'est donc pas tout à fait identique: «nombre de ceux qui seront sauvés» à côté de «nombre de Ses élus». Il importe de signaler pour une bonne interprétation que l'auteur dans ἐντεταγμένος ἔσται se sert d'un futur antérieur. A comparer pour ἐλλόγιμος le texte de 57:2: ἄμεινον γάρ ἐστιν ὑμῖν ἐν τῷ ποιμνίῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ μικροὺς καὶ ἐλλογίμους εὑρεθῆναι ἢ καθ' ὑπεροχὴν δοκοῦντας ἐκριφῆναι ἐκ τῆς ἐλπίδος αὐτοῦ: cela signifie «avoir été compté» et équivaut donc à «faire partie de...», par contraste avec «avoir été rejeté». Selon moi, les paroles de 58:2 n'impliquent pas qu'on mérite le salut éternel en obéissant aux commandements de Dieu (il ne s'agit pas d'un futur simple!). Mais le fait qu'on obéit aux ordres de Dieu montre clairement qu'on appartient au nombre de ceux qui seront sauvés comme dans I Jean 3:16: «Nous savons que nous sommes passés de la mort à la vie, parce que nous aimons les frères», ou II Pierre 1:10: «C'est pourquoi, frères, appliquez-vous à affirmer votre vocation et votre élection».

On n'a pas précisé en 58:2 ce qu'on entend exactement par le mot «nombre». Comme dans 35:4: ἡμεῖς οὖν ἀγωνισώμεθα εὑρεθῆναι ἐν τῷ ἀριθμῷ τῶν ὑπομενόντων, la signification est identique à celle de «parmi, avec», usage fréquent en grec[12]. Il contribue peu à éclaircir le sens de l'expression «nombre des élus», d'autant plus qu'il n'apporte pas de lumière sur la difficulté de savoir ce que veut dire exactement «garder intact».

Dans I Clément 2:4, 59:2, l'expression figure comme une locution connue, dont dépendra la conduite des chrétiens. A ce sujet, trois questions se présentent:

a) Cette conception est-elle connue dans la littérature chrétienne avant I Clément?

b) Est-ce qu'elle se rencontre après I Clément?

c) Quelle en est l'origine?

A) Dans le Nouveau Testament, l'expression ne se rencontre pas. On pourrait se référer à une conception quelque peu analogue dans Apoc. 6:11. Les martyrs défunts y voudraient savoir combien de temps il leur faudra attendre le jugement de Dieu, «et il leur fut dit de se tenir en repos quelque temps encore, jusqu'à ce que fût complet le nombre de leurs compagnons de service et de leurs frères qui devaient être mis à mort comme eux». Ici, on trouve donc un nombre fixe de martyrs, qui devra être complété avant la fin. Dans Apoc. 7:4: «Et j'entendis le nombre de ceux qui avaient été marqués du sceau, cent quarante-quatre mille, de toutes les tribus des fils d'Israël»; ils sont marqués comme la propriété du Seigneur et préservés par le sceau contre les attaques des puissances démoniaques[13]; mais le nombre est limité aux fils d'Israël.

B) Dans la littérature chrétienne du II^e^ et III^e^ siècle, cette conception, sans être généralement répandue, se rencontre quelquefois; l'état fragmentaire de la tradition littéraire exclut cependant toute théorie qui serait fondée sur la fréquence du phénomène.

En premier lieu, il faudra se référer à un texte dans Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 45:1. L'auteur cite Ps. 110:1-3 pour prouver ὅτι δὲ ἀγαγεῖν τὸν Χριστὸν εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ὁ πατὴρ τῶν πάντων θεὸς μετὰ τὸ ἀναστῆναι ἐκ νεκρῶν αὐτὸν ἔμελλε, καὶ κατέχειν ἕως ἂν πατάξῃ τοὺς ἐχθραίνοντας αὐτῷ δαίμονας καὶ συντελεσθῇ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν προεγνωσμένων αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶν γινομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων. C'est donc un *testimonium* sur une certaine partie de la doctrine chrétienne. On y constate que le Christ est au ciel, jusqu'à ce que les démons ennemis soient détruits et que le «nombre des élus»[14] soit complété. Le premier de ces deux compléments circonstanciels de temps se retrouve dans Ps. 110:1, 2, mais pour le deuxième il n'y a pas d'indication directe. Probablement, Justin en croyait trouver la preuve dans ces mots de l'Ecriture: μετὰ σοῦ ἡ ἀρχὴ ἐν ἡμέρᾳ τῆς δυνάμεώς σου ἐν ταῖς λαμπρότησι τῶν ἁγίων σου, où λαμπρότης peut correspondre avec ἀγαθῶν γινομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων. Pourtant, ils ne fournissent aucune explication sur les mots συντελεσθῇ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν προεγνωσμένων αὐτῷ. Cette différence est frappante et montre clairement à mon avis qu'il s'agit ici d'une affirmation appartenant à la dogmatique propre de Justin. On y prétend que le retour du Christ n'aura pas lieu avant qu'il y ait un nombre déterminé d'élus devenus vertueux.

En outre, l'on peut se référer à un texte dans le *Didascalia Apostolorum* que Funk et Connolly[15] ont rattaché aux endroits discutés plus haut de I Clément. Dans *Didasc.* 21 (Connolly, p. 185) (cf. *Const. Apost.* v 15:3), on

parle de l'incroyance des juifs et du miracle de la foi des païens: «and they also who are worthy[16] shall believe, until the number is filled of them that are to be saved» (texte grec: πλήρωμα τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν σῳζομένων); ensuite vient une citation de Ps. 68:18, qui se rencontre aussi ailleurs comme témoignage du règne du Christ. Ici encore, on parle d'un nombre fixe destiné à mériter le salut éternel, et c'est même ce nombre-là qui décidera de l'avènement de l'eschaton. Là où les juifs ont perdu la foi, les païens prennent leurs places pour compléter le nombre. A mon avis, on peut en conclure que la conception se base sur le nombre déterminé de membres du peuple juif qui par leur incroyance ne parviendront pas à fournir le nombre demandé, de sorte que celui-ci devra être complété par des convertis du monde païen.

Une prière pour le lecteur dans *Const. Apost.* VIII 22:3, où Dieu est appelé τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν σου διαφυλάττων, nous rappelle I Clément. Ici, la difficulté consiste dans le fait que cette prière ne remonte pas à l'Ordre Ecclésiastique d'Hippolyte, qui, comme nous savons, est à la base du huitième livre des *Const. Apost.* Par opposition à Hippolyte qui dit *expressis verbis*[17], que l'imposition des mains ne se fait pas pour le lecteur, celle-ci se pratique bien dans les *Const. Apost.* Il faut tenir compte ici d'une habitude postérieure. Il n'est pas clair d'où provient la rédaction de cette prière. Pourrait-il y avoir une influence directe de I Clément? Ou bien y a-t-il une source commune (prière juive) à la base des textes de I Clément et des *Const. Apost.*? Malheureusement, cette formule si brève de *Const. Apost.* VIII 22:3, ne saurait nous servir de point de départ pour l'explication du contexte théologique d'où il est pris.

Dans la prière pour un nouvel évêque dans *Const. Apost.* VIII, 5:6, on parle de ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σῳζομένων. Dans l'Ordre Ecclésiastique d'Hippolyte, cependant, cette phrase, qui détruit la structure logique de la prière chez Hippolyte[18], fait complètement défaut. On l'a ajoutée après, ce qui fait naître la question de savoir quelle signification il convient d'y attacher. S'agit-il d'une certaine activité missionnaire? Ou bien faut-il l'interpréter à la lumière d'un texte, dont les deux rédactions différentes nous sont parvenues dans *Didasc. Apost.* 11 (Connolly, p. 118) et *Const. Apost.* II 56:2. On y expose que c'est la volonté de Dieu que beaucoup soient sauvés, mais celui qui hait son prochain et se querelle avec lui, agit contre la volonté de Dieu, puisque, en agissant ainsi, il diminue le nombre (συστέλλειν τὸν ἀριθμόν), et l'on est, comme dit la *Didasc. Apost.*, «no helper with God for the gathering together of the people, because thou art a disturber and scatterer of the flock». Par là, l'unité de l'Eglise se perd. Et le problème ne concerne pas seulement l'organisation. Cette action nuit au nombre même de ceux qui pourraient être sauvés.

Dans cette ecclésiologie et cette eschatologie du christianisme primitif, on rencontre donc la conviction qu'il y a un nombre déterminé d'élus (ou: de ceux qui pourront être sauvés), qui doit être complété avant la consommation finale, et qu'il est défendu de violer par toutes sortes de querelles.

Lightfoot et Swete[19] ont fait observer la manière de formuler dans le «Order of the Burial of the Dead» de la liturgie anglicane, où on lit: «It may please Thee... shortly to accomplish the number of Thine Elect and to hasten Thy Kingdom». Je n'ai pas eu l'occasion de vérifier quelle en est l'origine et de contrôler si ces réflexions se rencontrent aussi ailleurs dans la tradition liturgique. Le parallélisme en tout cas est des plus curieux.

C) Or, la question se pose tout naturellement de savoir si cette conception du nombre déterminé des élus est originaire de l'eschatologie juive. On y trouve, en effet, quelques indications, bien qu'elles soient moins nombreuses qu'on ne l'eût supposé.

Dans *Apoc. Baruch* 23:4-5, on dit qu'après la chute d'Adam: «the multitude of those who shall be born was numbered, and for that number a place was prepared... Before therefore the number aforesaid is fulfilled the creature will not live again»[20]. Selon ce texte, la fin du monde viendra donc lorsque le nombre total des hommes — fixé dès le début de la création — aura vécu.

Dans IV *Esdras* 4:33 ss., comme dans l'Apocalypse de Jean, le cri retentit: Combien de temps encore? La réponse est double. D'un côté, on parle du temps fixé par Dieu: la fin viendra, comme pour les femmes à la fin de la grossesse, quand les chambres des morts seront pleines. Mais on se réfère également à une parole, qui fut déjà donnée à propos d'une question analogue sur les justes après leur mort: «quando impletus fuerit numerus similium vobis»[21]. L'accent porte donc sur le nombre des justes qui devront mourir.

Dans ce rapport, *Apoc. Abrah.* 29[22] est le plus explicite. On y parle des plaies dont Dieu punira la terre: «And then shall righteous men of thy seed be left (= survive the Messianic "woes") in the number which is kept secret by me, hastening in the glory of My Name to the place prepared beforehand for them (= Jerusalem)». Ici, il est donc question d'un nombre de fidèles connu de Dieu et qui restera intact à travers les temps désastreux qui précèdent la Fin.

Ce qui est curieux, c'est que tous ces textes se rencontrent dans des écrits, datant d'après la chute de Jérusalem (70). Faute de sources, nous ne savons pas si cette idée était déjà connue à une époque antérieure. Il est vrai que, dans une apocalypse comme Marc 13, on parle en général des élus, mais pas d'un nombre fixe.

La conception est donc présentée de façon différente. Il est question d'un nombre déterminé des hommes en général ou de justes, qui doit être complété avant la consommation finale. Mais, dans l'*Apoc. Abrah.*, le nombre est fixe et doit être sauvegardé à travers les maux messianiques.

L'origine de ces conceptions n'est pas claire. Volz[23], qui notait les textes, ne parle pas non plus de leur origine. Une idée analogue se rencontre dans celle du «livre de la vie» ou «livre des vivants» où l'on a noté les noms d'avance, mais d'où ils peuvent être effacés[24]. On pourrait croire à une certaine affinité: cependant, il est impossible de découvrir l'origine à l'aide des textes qui sont connus à présent. Tout ce qui en ressort clairement, c'est la croyance à la prédestination, qui est si caractéristique pour l'eschatologie juive.

Dans les conceptions si variées de l'eschatologie juive, l'idée se rencontrait parfois qu'un nombre déterminé de personnes participerait au salut futur. Elle fonctionne de deux manières:

a) la fin viendra, quand ce nombre sera complété (les hommes en général, les martyrs, les justes);

b) il y a un nombre fixe, qui se conserve dans la crise même, qui précède la fin.

Cependant, on n'insiste nulle part là-dessus.

En revenant maintenant dans la *Ia Clementis*, nous constatons que l'auteur se sert de cette idée, présente dans l'eschatologie juive et empruntée par l'eschatologie du christianisme primitif. Il faut signaler en plus que, pour I Clément, les «élus» sont les justes et les innocents (voir 46:3-4: καὶ πάλιν ἐν ἑτέρῳ τόπῳ λέγει «Μετὰ ἀνδρὸς ἀθῴου ἀθῷος ἔσῃ καὶ μετ' ἐκλεκτοῦ ἐκλεκτός...». Κολληθῶμεν οὖν τοῖς ἀθῴοις καὶ δικαίοις· εἰσὶν δὲ οὗτοι ἐκλεκτοὶ τοῦ θεοῦ; ce texte est d'un grand intérêt pour l'exégèse de 59:2); la conduite extérieure fait voir si l'on appartient aux élus, oui ou non.

Les données, tout en étant assez rares, nous permettent cependant de reconstruire l'image que voici: Dieu a fixé le nombre de ceux qui seront élus; la fin viendra lorsque ce nombre sera obtenu; ceux qui en font partie devront être conduits intacts à travers les temps de l'oppression, les maux messianiques. Voilà pourquoi il faut prier Dieu, pour qu'Il garde ce nombre intact les jours des persécutions, de l'apostasie et de toutes sortes d'oppressions, par l'effet de Sa protection.

Il me semble que 1 Clém. 2:4 doit se lire sous le jour de 59:2. L'exégèse de μετ' ἐλέους καὶ συνειδήσεως reste difficile. Conformément au langage de Clément, on peut considérer ἔλεος comme «miséricorde divine», et συνείδησις comme «obéissance humaine à la volonté de Dieu»[25]. Pour le moment, je ne vois pas d'autre solution. Or cette exégèse s'accorde bien avec la suite des idées de cette lettre. Evidemment, le salut est dû unique-

ment à la pitié de Dieu, mais d'autre part l'homme, c'est-à-dire le juste, doit rester dans le chemin des commandements de Dieu. On peut, comme il apparaît dans la *Didasc. Apost.* postérieur, nuire au nombre, on peut en être exclu.

Comme nous l'avons déjà fait remarquer, il y avait selon Knopf une opposition entre cette pensée et le moralisme de 1 Clément. A la lumière des données eschatologiques, aussi bien dans le Nouveau Testament qu'ailleurs, je ne peux pas partager son opinion. L'expression ἀριθμὸς τῶν ἐκλεκτῶν αὐτοῦ ne fait que mieux ressortir les exhortations. Les querelles, qui avaient divisé l'Eglise de Corinthe, ne se livraient pas uniquement sur le plan humain, mais portaient atteinte au plan divin. Elles nuisaient au nombre déterminé de Dieu. Les exhortations à la conversion, à l'humilité, etc., sont conformes à la volonté de Dieu, dit l'auteur, et, par là, elles créent le climat nécessaire pour sauvegarder le nombre intact. Aussi ces préceptes sont autre chose que de simples exhortations; ils sont directement liés au plan du salut divin.

Au début de la lettre, c'est l'Eglise de Corinthe qui dit cette prière, donc cette même communauté, où plus tard les conditions seront tellement contraires à la tendance de cette prière. A la fin c'est un membre de l'Eglise de Rome qui la répète. On ne saurait nier le caractère véritablement œcuménique de cette prière qui embrasse toute la chrétienté. Ici, prière, foi et conduite se confondent de façon harmonieuse.

NOTES

* Paru dans: *Revue d'Histoire et de Philosphie religieuses* XLII (1962), p. 237-246.

[1] Pour plus de facilité, nous appelons l'auteur inconnu de l'épître «Clément».

[2] W. K. Lowther Clarke, *The First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians*, London 1937, p. 87: «A traditional eschatological phrase, probably enshrined in liturgical language»; mais Clarke ne donne pas de textes pour prouver le caractère eschatologique.

[3] R. Knopf, *Die Lehre der Zwölf Apostel, die zwei Clemensbriefe*, Tübingen 1920, p. 46.

[4] Cf. I Pierre 5:9.

[5] J.-A. Fischer, *Die apostolischen Väter*[3], Darmstadt 1959, p. 27, n. 18.

[6] Rom. 15:30, Col. 2:1, 4:12; ainsi E. Stauffer, dans G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1933, t. I, p. 131.

[7] Δέος au lieu de ἔλεος dans le ms. H; καθαρᾶς + συνειδήσεως dans les versions.

[8] F. Blass-A. Debrunner, *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, tr. and ed. by R. W. Funk, Cambridge 1961, 198, p. 3-4.

[9] ἔλεος: 9:1, 28:1, 50:2 (dans des citations 18:1-2, 22:8, 56:5). συνείδησις: 1:3, 34:7, 41:1, 45:7.

[10] Voir H. G. Liddell-R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*[9], Oxford 1940, p. 1748, s.v.; ainsi 1 Clem. 7:6, 11:1, 12:1.

[11] J.-A. Fischer, op. cit., p. 99, n. 340.

[12] Liddell-Scott, op. cit., p. 240: «As a mark of station, worth, rank»; *Mart. Pol.* 14:2 Clem. Alex., *Strom.* III 10:70:4; *Act. Thom.*, 156.

[13] R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, Edinburgh 1920, p. 205 f.

[14] προγιγνώσκω = élire, comme dans Rom. 8:29, 11:2.

[15] F. X. Funk, *Didascalia et Constitutiones Apostolorum*, Paderbornae 1905, p. 282: R. H. Connolly, *Didascalia Apostolorum*, Oxford 1929, p. 185.

[16] Cf. Act. 13:46.

[17] G. Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, London 1937: «For he does not have hands laid upon him», et voir Dix, l.c., p. xxii.

[18] Texte latin, éd. Dix, l.c., p. 5: «Sine repraehensione servientem noctu et die, incessanter repropitiari vultum tuum et offerre dona sanctae ecclesiae tuae»; *Const. Apost.* viii 5:6 ἐξιλασκόμενόν σου τὸ πρόσωπον, ἐπισυναγαγεῖν τὸν ἀριθμὸν τῶν σῳζομένων καὶ προσφέρειν σοι τὰ δῶρα τῆς ἁγίας σου ἐκκλησίας.

[19] J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*, Part. I, *S. Clement of Rome*[2], vol. II, London 1890, p. 19; H. B. Swete, *The Apocalypse of St. John*, London 1906, p. 90.

[20] Version de R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1913, vol. II, p. 495.

[21] L. Gry, *Les Dires prophétiques d'Esdras* (*IV Esdras*), Paris 1938, vol. I, p. 38.

[22] G. H. Box, *The Apocalypse of Abraham*, London 1919, p. 81.

[23] P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*[2], Tübingen 1934, pp. 140, 158, 352.

[24] Sur ces «livres», voir: H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1924, t. II, p. 169 ff.; W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*[3], Tübingen 1926, p. 258.

[25] Voir notre article «I Clement 34 and the "Sanctus"», dans: *Vigiliae Christianae* V (1951), p. 231 ss. [voir ci-dessus, p. 326 ss.].

ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ IN THE *CATECHETICAL HOMILIES* OF THEODORE OF MOPSUESTIA*

In a recent publication on the Semitic background of παρρησία in the New Testament[1], I drew attention to the fact that in the Syriac version a curious situation exists in connection with this noun. On the one hand, it has been simply transliterated and taken over as a loan-word; but, on the other, its place is taken by an indigenous metaphor *galiouth panim*, lit. "uncovering (or revealing) of the face". The Syriac translation of the New Testament uses these words interchangeably. It was the metaphor, I argued, that lurked in the mind of St. Paul in writing or dictating 2 Corinthians 3:12-18.

In discussing this typically Semitic expression and illustrating its usages from Syriac and other texts, I left out one remarkable passage in the *Catechetical Homilies* of Theodore of Mopsuestia, the Syriac translation of which was discovered and published 30 years ago by my revered teacher and friend Dr. A. Mingana[2]. This "omission" was made for good reasons. These Homilies, which are of the greatest importance for our understanding of dogmatics and liturgy in the 4th century, were written originally in Greek. However, because the original is lost, we must have recourse to the Syriac. Nevertheless, in using these homilies we must always be aware of the fact that we are dealing with a translation and must therefore keep in mind the Greek original. Therefore, one cannot expect to receive much help here in understanding better the relation between παρρησία and the "uncovering of the face". And yet there is a curious passage which may have some bearing upon it, which at least deserves some discussion in this connection.

The word παρρησία holds an important place in the Christian vocabulary[3]. It will be interesting, therefore, to see how it was used by a representative theologian in the great fourth century. In this instance, the fact that we do not possess the original text but only the Syriac translation is not too grave a handicap, since this version has kept the Greek word in its transliterated form. In order to see the specific text we have in mind in its proper perspective, it will be wise to take into account the other places where the noun occurs.

One more observation may precede our discussion. As is well-known the word παρρησία and the verb, derived from it, occur many times in the New Testament. One might have expected that texts, containing these words, would have been quoted among the many texts from the Scriptures which he whom the later Nestorians called "the Expositor" cites.

None of these Biblical citations, however, contains the word παρρησία, so that it is impossible to draw any conclusions regarding its meaning.

In 8 out of 9 passages, παρρησία has a strictly religious meaning and expresses a particular aspect of the relation between God and man. The only exception is Hom. IX:2 (M. V, p. 94 = T. p. 214-215). In speaking of the Council of Nicea Theodore says: "For the time gave them freedom (*parrhèsia*) to assemble[4], because the God-loving and the blessed Constantine urged them to it in order to destroy the wickedness of the heretics and to confirm the faith of the Church". Here the notion of "freedom of action" is in keeping with current Greek speech[5].

Elswhere, the *parrhèsia* is always one of the specific elements of the new life of the Christian. This is most clearly seen in the passage where Theodore speaks about the words of address in the Lord's Prayer (*Hom.* XI:7, M. VI, p. 6 = T. p. 296-297). In the same way as Origen[6], our author considers the fact that we are allowed to address God as "our Father" a special Christian favour and distinction. In contrast to those under the Law of Moses, Jesus says to His disciples: "You have received through Me the grace of the Holy Spirit, whereby you have attained adoption as sons and *parrhèsia* to call God, "Father". You have not received the Spirit in order to be again in servitude and fear but to be worthy of the Spirit of adoption as sons through which you call God, "Father", with *parrhèsia*". The background of this passage is unmistakable, namely, Paul in Rom. 8:15 (cf. Gal. 4:5). The apostle, however, does not use *parrhèsia* in this connection; but one may refer to a text like Hebrews 4:16, which was considered Pauline by Theodore. In the sequel of his exposition Theodore does not specify this *parrhèsia*; rather, he explains that God is "Lord" and Creator of everything, but also "the Father" by Whom Christians acquire the freedom of an immortal life and the honour of being a son of God. This is given to the Christian by the Spirit. In this connection *parrhèsia* has not only the notion of "confidence", but also and foremost that of "liberty" or "freedom of speech". In contrast with the Gentiles, the Christians know the only God; in contrast with the Jews, they serve Him not as slaves, but as sons, and they have free intercourse with the Almighty God. The depth of the great idea which is expressed here by Theodore is only rightly understood if we realize on the one hand, that *parrhèsia* in secular Greek is the right of free citizens or the privilege of true friends[7], and on the other, that the service of God is awe-inspiring[8].

This *parrhèsia* has become the share of the Christians by their profession of faith at baptism, for 'after we have, by our profession of faith, made our contracts and engagements with God our Lord through the

intermediary of the priest, we become worthy to enter His house and enjoy its sight, its knowledge and its habitation, and to be also enrolled in the city and its citizenship: a great *parrhèsia* is ours'' (*Hom.* XII 27, M. VI, p. 34 = T. p. 366-367). In view of the connection between *parrhèsia* and the rights of a Greek *politès*, the last part of this quotation is very striking: the political idea has been transferred to the city of God.

Jesus Christ as man possessed *parrhèsia* by which He was able to conquer death and to grant immunity from death to all mankind (*Hom.* VII 13, M. V, p. 80 = T. p. 180-181). Here in quoting John 10:18—''I have power to lay my life down and I have power to take it up again''—Theodore takes the word in the sense of ''power'', ''liberty''[9]. But at the same time it expresses the close union with God which, according to the Christology of Theodore—a matter which we need not discuss here—, the man Jesus had with the Godhead. This is expressed in a most interesting paragraph (*Hom.* XII 9, M. VI, p. 22 = T. p. 336-337) in which Theodore's ''Cur Deus Homo'' is set forth: to rectify the state of humanity, made desperate by sin, God ''assumed a man from us, who was a faithful keeper of the Divine commandments, and was found to be free from all sin''. Jesus suffered an unjust death by the hand of the Jews, ''and He became for ever immune from death, and immortal and incorruptible by nature''. He ascended into heaven out of the reach of Satan. Then Theodore continues: ''From the fact that the man who was assumed from us had such a *parrhèsia*, He became a messenger on behalf of all the human race so that the rest of mankind might participate with Him in His great change''. On this basis rests Theodore's exposition of the sacraments, in which ''the symbols of the freedom from calamities from which we were unexpectedly delivered, and of our participation in these new and great benefits which had their beginning in Christ our Lord'' are performed. *Parrhèsia* in this context is not only confidence that He would conquer death, but also and foremost Jesus' perfect union with the Godhead.

By the grace of God and not the merits of men, these gifts are given to men through the work of Jesus Christ, who did away with all evil and ''made us completely immortal and immutable, and takes us up to heaven, and gave us that we shall have great *parrhèsia* towards Him and great friendship and fellowship with the hosts that are invisible and true to God''. All this, so Theodore explains, is contained in the prayer of the priest at the beginning of the Canon Missae, 'Peace be unto you' (*Hom.* XV 34, M. VI, p. 90 = T. p. 514-515). This free intercourse of men with God will not only be a gift for the heavenly future, but it is already enjoyed here where the sacraments are 'proleptic eschatology', and where the firstfruits of the Spirit are present (see e.g. *Hom.* XVI 30, M.

VI, p. 115 = T. p. 582-583). In commenting upon the communion, Theodore states that when the bread, which actually becomes the Body of Christ at the coming of the Holy Spirit, is received with awe and love: "you offer your prayers as if to Christ our Lord, who is at present so near to you, for you possess already the great *parrhèsia* which you hoped for, when you drew near and took it (or Him), you received the *parrhèsia*" (*Hom.* XVI 28, M. VI, p. 114 = T. p. 578-579). Here the word is found in the typical setting in which it is commonly used by our author. We find here the eschatological gift which is now present; the free intercourse in prayer with Him who said, "All power is given unto Me in heaven and on earth" (Matth. 28:18, a text quoted in this paragraph); and the feeling of awe and love at the same time.

In the next section of his exposition of the Liturgy, Theodore speaks about Jesus' words, "This is My body which is broken for you for the remission of sins, etc." (Matth. 26:26 ff.), in relation to the daily sins of Christians. He gives a long typological explanation of Isaiah's vision, Ch. 6: the coal which cleanses the prophet's unclean lips in the eucharistic bread; it is taken with tongs. The function of the priest in the communion service is compared with these tongs. The priest himself is not worthy, "but in the place of tongs he possesses the spiritual grace, which he received in his priesthood[10], and from which he acquired the *parrhèsia* for giving such things". The meaning of the word is nicely explained in the next sentence: "He holds the elements with his hand, so that he may himself receive confidence with his own hands; and he not only is not in fear because of their greatness (or: majesty), but has much confidence because of their grace". Then the priest does the service of the tongs towards the believers: he acts with "great *parrhèsia*, because of the grace of the Spirit conferred upon him for this service". And the preacher continues, "You have fear because of the greatness of the gift, but when you have received it, you will put your trust on Him who granted such things to mankind, and who bestowed also such a *parrhèsia* upon the priest: not only upon himself alone, but upon those who are in need of the grace of God" (*Hom.* XVI 38, M. VI, p. 119-120 = T. p. 494-495). Here again *parrhèsia* is used in a context of the awe-inspiring divine Presence; but fear is done away with by grace. It is a gift of the Holy Spirit and is almost identical with "confidence", together with an overtone of "liberty". By this gift men are enabled to have intercourse with the world of the Holy God now and evermore, unbroken by any barrier or impediment.

To summarize what we have found so far, we may say the following: *parrhèsia* is an expression for the new life of Christians; the "freedom of the children of God" who, by the work of Jesus Christ, are no longer separated from the Almighty, Holy and Eternal God, and who, as

citizens of God's world, converse with Him as their Father. It is a gift of the Holy Spirit which is enjoyed here in the sacraments and prayer. It is remarkable that though this new life has its ethical implications, the word *parrhèsia* is practically restricted to the sphere of the relation between God and man and is not applied to inter-human relationships, such as the preaching of the Gospel[11].

Now let us turn to the passage which was the starting-point for this paper, and which has been left undiscussed so far.

As we saw before (p. 135f.) the gift of this *parrhèsia* to the individual Christian was bestowed upon him at his baptism. This is most fully and clearly described in *Hom.* XIII 18 (M. VI, p. 46-47 = T. p. 396-399).

In this passage Theodore explains the significance of the first anointing of the one to be baptized which precedes the ceremony of baptism proper.

The ritual as followed in Theodore's church included three anointings:
a) on the forehead, after the Renunciation of Satan and the Profession of faith;
b) of the whole body immediately before baptism;
c) on the forehead after baptism.
The place, meaning and relation of these various anointings have often been discussed by liturgiologists, especially the prebaptismal ones[12]. For the present purpose we are only concerned with *a*), and it is sufficient to know what meaning Theodore attached to it.

The ritual is as follows: the candidate for baptism is kneeling with his hands outstretched as for prayer, and in this position he renunciates the service of Satan and by his profession of faith engages himself to the service of God. Then the priest in radiant linen makes the sign on his forehead with the holy Chrism, saying, "in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Spirit".

This is called by Theodore "the firstfruits of the sacrament", and afterwards the candidates "receive the remaining part of the sacrament and are invested with the complete armour of the Spirit". But what does this part of the ceremony mean? It should be observed that Theodore is far more explicit on this anointing than on the other two, and it seems as though he did attach more weight to it than to the others. He says, "The sign with which you are signed means that you have been stamped as a lamb of Christ and as a soldier of the heavenly King". These two similes[13] are treated in a more elaborate form. He has only a short remark about the frightening of the demons by this mark[14]: "so that from far we may frighten the demons, who will not then be able to come near us and injure us". The receivers are "members of the household and soldiers of Christ". And, Theodore finally says, the priest "separates you

from the rest as a consequence of the aforesaid words, and decides that you are the soldier of the true King and a citizen of heaven''[15]. It is remarkable that this positive side is so outstanding; it is not so much an expulsion of the demons[16]—the exorcism has already taken place—, but an allegiance to Christ and the heavenly kingdom.

In this connection the preacher also explains why the sign is given on the forehead. This passage is particularly interesting for our present purpose. It runs like this: ''...stamped on your forehead, that part of your head which is higher than the rest of your body, which is placed above all your body and above your face, and with which we usually draw near to one another and look at one another when we speak. You are stamped at that place so that you may be seen to possess great *parrhèsia*. 'Because now we see through a glass darkly, but then face to face, and with an uncovered face we behold[17] as in a glass the glory of the Lord, and are changed into the same image from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord', as the blessed Paul said (1 Cor. 13:12; 2 Cor. 3:18), we are rightly stamped in a place that is higher than our face, so that from far we may frighten the demons, who will not then be able to come near us and injure us, and so that we may be known to possess so much *parrhèsia* towards God that we look at Him with an uncovered face, and display before Him the stamp by which we are seen to be members of the household and soldiers of Christ our Lord''.

The combination of the two different Pauline texts[18] is interesting. They are linked together by the words ''face'' and ''mirror'' (or: glass). They fit perfectly the conception Theodore had of the sacraments which by symbols give a share in the heavenly world of what once will be shared in reality. They aptly illustrate his idea of the sacraments as ''proleptic eschatology''.

The text of the quotation of 2 Cor. 3:18 is identical with that of the Peshitta; but the Syriac translation of these Homilies has not been tampered with since it is clear from the paraphrase in the following sentences that Theodore took κατοπτριζόμενοι in the sense of ''seeing as in a mirror''[19].

So far, no parallels to this particular explanation of Theodore have been found, not even in the recently published catechetical sermons of Chrysostom[20]. The closest agreement may be found in Cyrillus Hieros., *Cat. Myst.* III 4 καὶ πρῶτον ἐχρίεσθε ἐπὶ τὸ μέτωπον, ἵνα ἀπαλλαγῆτε τῆς αἰσχύνης, ἣν ὁ πρῶτος παραβάτης ἄνθρωπος πανταχοῦ περιέφερε, καὶ ἵνα ἀνακεκαλυμμένῳ προσώπῳ τὴν δόξαν κυρίου κατοπτρίζησθε. It should be noticed, however, that Cyril is dealing here with the anointing *after* baptism and that here the forehead is the first one in a series of parts of the body which are anointed. On the other hand, it is remarkable to find the

same text of St. Paul connected with the anointing of the forehead, and we may also remind ourselves that the attitude of the baptismal candidate at this moment, according to Theodore, is an expression of the fall of mankind, which also offers a parallel. In Cyril this seal makes the receiver free from shame and permits him to see the glory of God with an uncovered face; while in Theodore it gives *parrhèsia* which is the complementary opposite of shame[21]; so that one may see the glory of God with an uncovered face. It is possible, although exact proof is lacking at the moment, that Cyril and Theodore both draw upon a certain traditional explanation of the sealing of the forehead. In this connection one may also point to another passage in which Cyril speaks about the "seal", viz. *Cat.* I 2, which offers a striking parallelism to Theodore's exposition: προσέλθετε εἰς τὴν μυστικὴν σφραγῖδα ἵνα εὔγνωστοι ἦτε τῷ δεσπότῃ· συγκαταριθμήθητε τῇ ἁγίᾳ καὶ λογικῇ τοῦ Χριστοῦ ποίμνῃ.

Another indication of Theodore's use of traditional language may be found in the description of baptism in the *Acta Thomae* XXV-XXVII[22]. There it is said about the anointing of the head in Ch. XXVI: "Our souls are turned to God to receive the sign, for we have heard that all the sheep of that God whom thou preachest are known to Him by the sign". In the preceding chapter the prayer of the apostle contains the same imagery, but also adds *i.a.* "they wish to become servants of Thine", in Syriac *pôlche*, the very same word used in the Syriac translation of Theodore for "soldiers"[23]. Another interesting feature in this prayer is the fact that the apostle asks for "*parrhèsia* in Thee", which may give still another link with Theodore. Whether this is a real parallel or not depends on the question of how *parrhèsia* should be interpreted here. Klijn[24] takes it in the sense of "boldness" in relation to God, but in view of the preceding sentence which speaks about being persecuted and hated for God's sake, it may also mean the "boldness" in confessing the faith in front of the enemies[25]. It is not easy to make a decision here. If, however, the latter interpretation is correct, the parallelism disappears, though it may be that traditionally *parrhèsia* in itself, allowing both interpretations, was connected with the stamp of the anointing.

What does it mean for Theodore to say: "we look at Him with an uncovered face"? It is more than mere repetition of a Pauline phrase, because he repeats the words with some emphasis and as a link in his train of thought. Indeed, the answer to this question may be found in the comments Theodore makes in *Hom.* XVI 6 (M. VI, p. 100 = T. p. 542-543) on the attitude of the Seraphim in Isaiah 6:3: "The spiritual hosts appeared to look with great awe and reverence, since they were looking downwards and covering their faces completely with their wings". This explanation is not an invention of Theodore, but agrees

with a conception that is widespread in antiquity. It may also be a sign of shame. The opposite, "with uncovered face", means that man feels no shame (cf. also Cyrill. Hier., above p. 139), and that the awe which a creature feels before the Holy God is taken away[26].

Therefore Theodore can say that this sign is a mark of *parrhèsia*. This is not a subjective feeling of "confidence" (so Mingana translated[27], an interpretation which conflicts with the other 'objective' explanations). It is the free access to God, the liberty to speak to the Holy God as a Father in full accordance with the meaning of the word elsewhere in these Homilies (see p. 135). This interpretation is also confirmed by the words of Theodore that this sign is given at that place "with which we usually draw near to one another and look at one another when we speak". This anointing on the forehead is, so to speak, the passport for free entrance into the presence of the Almighty God.

This text of Theodore cannot be used as evidence for the identity of *parrhèsia* and "uncovering of the face" (see p. 139), for he clearly distinguishes: "we possess so much *parrhèsia* with God that we look at Him with an uncovered face". And yet, there is still something mysterious about this passage.

It is very curious that Theodore quotes in this passage after the first *parrhèsia* those texts of St. Paul which he does and not another one like Eph. 3:12 or Hebr. 4:16, for 1 Cor. 13:12 and 2 Cor. 3:18 do not seem to have any connection with it. On the other hand, we found the latter text also quoted by Cyril, so it seems to be traditional in that connection (see p. 139). Besides that, Theodore does not use the expression "with an uncovered face" as a mere figure of speech, for literally he says, "we are rightly stamped... that it may be known that we have *parrhèsia* towards God, that we look at Him with an uncovered face *where* we also show before Him the stamp, etc.". So the uncovered face is an indispensable element in the train of thought. Also, much stress is laid on the fact that the seal is given on the forehead; and again, it should be noted that the sealing is explained in this way and not, e.g., by a text like Ezek. 9:4. So the "uncovered face" seems to be more important than it looks at first sight. In Theodore's explanation it stands somewhat like a foreign element, for it is explicitly said afterwards that the candidates for baptism were "bareheaded"[28], so that there was no need to say with so much emphasis that they have the *parrhèsia* to look at God with an "uncovered face". So this whole explanation seems to be more or less a "Fremdkörper" here, but well assimilated by Theodore. We saw that his exposition in this place makes use of traditional language. Are we correct in supposing that this is also the case here? If that is so, then I venture to put forward in a very tentative way the hypothesis that this goes back to a

practice at baptism in which the candidates had their heads covered, and at this point were uncovered. This is a mere hypothesis for which no definitive evidence has been found thus far, and it is superfluous to add how exceedingly scanty our evidence for the baptismal practices in the 2nd and 3rd centuries is.

This paper may have shown the great value that *parrhèsia* possessed in the religious thinking and life of Theodore. In this particular and typical description of the Christian's relation to God, he does not stand alone. It would be interesting to compare his usage with that of Chrysostom or Gregory of Nyssa[29] and to see the remarkable semasiological development of this word in the Christian vocabulary from the New Testament to the fourth century[30]. This, however, falls outside the scope of this article.

May this investigation of a Greek word with such a specific Christian stamp which combined semasiology and liturgiology be a small token of gratitude to that distinguished scholar in whose honour this volume is published, and who by her own writings has so enriched our understanding of the life of the early Christians as it was expressed in their vocabulary and service.

NOTES

* Appeared in: *Mélanges offerts à Mlle Christine Mohrmann*, Utrecht-Antwerpen 1963, p. 12-22.

[1] W. C. van Unnik, De semitische achtergrond van ΠΑΡΡΗΣΙΑ in het Nieuwe Testament, in: *Mededelingen der Koninklijke Nederlandse Akademie van Wetenschappen, afd. Letterkunde*, N. R. XXV, II, Amsterdam 1962 [English translation in *Sparsa Collecta II*, p. 290-306].

[2] A. Mingana, *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Nicene Creed*. Woodbrooke Studies, vol. V, Cambridge 1932, and: *Commentary of Theodore of Mopsuestia on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist*. (Woodbrooke Studies, vol. VI), Cambridge 1933 (quoted as: M. V and M. VI). See also the more recent French edition: R. Tonneau (en collaboration avec R. Devreesse), *Les Homélies catéchétiques de Théodore de Mopsueste*, in: *Studi e Testi* 145, Città del Vaticano 1949 (quoted as: T.).—Tonneau gives a facsimile of the Syriac manuscript with a French translation on the opposite pages, and it is to that edition that we refer for the Syriac text. We usually quote from Mingana's English translation, which however is changed at certain points where it seemed necessary for our investigation (with due reverence for that great scholar Dr. Mingana, of course).

[3] See W. C. van Unnik, l.c., p. 3-4, [op. cit., p. 290-1] and the literature quoted there.

[4] Mingana translates: "the time was propitious for their gathering", but a more literal translation is needed here.

[5] E. Peterson, *Zur Bedeutungsgeschichte von* παρρησία, in: *Reinhold Seeberg-Festschrift*, Leipzig 1929, p. 285.

[6] *Peri euchès* 22, 1.

[7] See Peterson, op. cit., *passim* and H. Schlier, s.v., in G. Kittel-G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1954, vol. V, p. 869ff.

[8] This theme is recurring everywhere in Theodore's exposition. See also on this "numinous" aspect of Eastern liturgical thinking the fine article of Ed. Bishop, Fear and

Awe attaching to the Eucharistic Service, Appendix II to: R. H. Connolly, *The Liturgical Homilies of Narsai*, Cambridge 1909, p. 92 ff.

[9] Here it is almost identical with ἐξουσία, see above note 5.

[10] Cf. also Theodore's exposition of the words "And with Thy Spirit" in *Hom.* xv 37-38 (M. VI, p. 91 f. = T. p. 518 ff.).

[11] As in the New Testament very markedly, see my T. W. Manson—Memorial Lecture: *The Christian's Freedom of Speech in the New Testament*, Manchester 1962. [also in: *Sparsa Collecta II*, p. 269-289]

[12] The latest discussion in: H. B. Green, 'The Significance of the Pre-Baptismal Seal in St. John Chrysostom, in F. L. Cross (ed.), *Studia Patristica*, Berlin 1962, vol. VI, p. 84 ff.

[13] Cf. F. J. Dölger, *Sphragis. Eine altchristliche Taufbezeichnung in ihren Beziehungen zur profanen und religiösen Kultur des Altertums*, Paderborn 1911, p. 105 f. (Schaf); p. 32 ff. (Soldat).

[14] Cf. F. J. Dölger, op. cit., p. 120 ff.; H. B. Green, l.l., p. 88 ff.

[15] Philippians 3:20 is a favorite text of Theodore, see references in Tonneau, l.c., p. 608, index.

[16] This pre-baptismal anointing is not connected with the exorcism of the candidates for baptism, which has been dealt with in a previous homily.

[17] Mingana translates here, "we shall behold", with a future tense, but the Syriac text favours the present tense, as is also made clear by Theodore's own exposition in the following sentences.

[18] See on their meaning: A. Hugédé, *La métaphore du miroir dans les Epîtres de saint Paul aux Corinthiens*, Neuchâtel-Paris 1957.

[19] On the various interpretations of this difficult word see the commentaries, esp. H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*[9], Göttingen 1924, p. 128, and: E. B. Allo, *Saint Paul, Seconde épître aux Corinthiens*, Paris 1936, p. 96.

[20] A. Wenger, *Jean Chrysostome, Huit Catéchèses Baptismales inédites*, Paris 1957.

[21] Examples in H. Schlier, op. cit., p. 871 f. and my paper: *De semitische achtergrond, passim.*

[22] A. F. J. Klijn, *The Acts of Thomas*, Leiden 1962, p. 76 ff. and his commentary, p. 205 ff. See also his discussion of baptism in these Acts on p. 54 ff.

[23] The Syriac word has both meanings, see: J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford 1903, p. 448 (I do not build any argument on this point, but it seemed noteworthy).

[24] Klijn, l.c., p. 208.

[25] So the word is often used in the Acts of the Martyrs, see: H. Schlier, op. cit., p. 883 f.

[26] See my paper, quoted in note 1, for references.

[27] Tonneau translates in the first instance, "assurance", and in the second, "liberty"; I do not see any reason for this change, and on the whole the latter translation seems preferable.

[28] The interesting part of the ceremony, described here by Theodore, needs a separate treatment which I hope to give elsewhere.

[29] Cf. J. Daniélou, *Platonisme et théologie mystique, essai sur la doctrine spirituelle de saint Grégoire de Nysse*, Paris 1944, p. 110 f.

[30] Some outline appears in the articles of Peterson and Schlier, but the material needs a much fuller discussion.

A NOTE ON THE DANCE OF JESUS IN THE *ACTS OF JOHN**

One of the most interesting episodes in the apocryphal *Acts of John* is that of Jesus' dancing with his disciples (ch. 94 ff.). Particularly interesting there is the great hymn Jesus sings with the constant "amen" of the disciples. Its phraseology is so peculiar and has such a "Gnostic" ring that it has often attracted the attention of scholars, without yielding a generally accepted explanation. But the setting of this hymn is not less curious, for it is sung during a dance, and this feature is rather unique in the history of early liturgical traditions. Is it a sign of the "heretical" character of these Acts and what was its origin?

Jesus is reported to have said: "Before I am delivered up unto them (viz. the Jews) let us sing a hymn to the Father, and so go forth to that which lieth before us. He bade us therefore make as it were a ring, holding one another's hands, and himself standing in the midst he said: Answer Amen unto me"[1]. Then follows a doxology and the hymn in which we underscore the following lines: "Grace danceth. I would pipe; dance ye all... The number Twelve danceth on high. The Whole on high hath part in our dancing. Whoso danceth not, knoweth not what cometh to pass...". Ch. 96 Jesus calls them to dance: "Now answer thou unto my dancing" and addresses his followers as "thou that dancest". This episode is closed in ch. 97 with the words of John: "Thus, my beloved, having danced with us the Lord went forth"; the disciples fly away and Jesus suffers.

At what occasion did Jesus make this dance? From ch. 97 one would get the impression that it is suggested to have happened while He was in Gethsemane (Matth. 26:30 ff. and parr.). On the other hand it seems more likely that this account takes the place of the description of the Passover-meal. Matthew (26:30) and Mark (14:26) expressly state that "they went out after having sung" and this is correctly taken by the commentators as a reference to the Jewish practice of singing the Hallel-Psalms[2]. It is quite possible that the author of these Acts, leaving out many details of the Passion-story, has telescoped these two incidents into one. However that may be, neither in the New Testament accounts of the passion nor in other apocryphal traditions do we find anything which parallels this dancing. We look in vain for a clue in the collection of material about the Jewish Passover-festival in Billerbeck's commentary[3].

Was this feature an invention of the writer of these Acts of his own accord; did he describe a festival of an unknown sect where this dance had taken the place of the Lord's Supper? There is no commandment of

repetition, given by Jesus here; the story is told as though it happened just before Jesus was delivered, only on that day with this particular group of disciples. So it is likely that it is a speciality of the author. But once more we may ask: was it an invention of his or does there exist a link with the Jewish ritual?

To answer this question I should like to draw attention to a passage in the Homily of Bishop Melito of Sardis on the Passover, that gem of early Christian preaching which was so happily rediscovered in the last 25 years[4]. In a passage addressed to the Jewish people Melito vividly recalls what they did when they put their Lord to death. His love of antithesis is also displayed in this description § 80[5]: Thou hast slain thy Lord in the Great Feast

> And thou wast of good cheer, but he was hungry;
> thou wast eating bread and drinking wine, but he vinegar and gall;
> thou wast glad of countenance, but he was sad;
> thou wast rejoicing, but he was oppressed;
> thou wast psalmsinging, but he was judged
> (σὺ ἔψαλλες, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐκρίνετο)
> thou gavest command, he was nailed (to the cross);
> thou wast dancing, but he was being laid in the tomb
> (σὺ ἐχόρευες, ἐκεῖνος δὲ ἐθάπτετο)
> thou wast lying upon a soft cushion[6], but he in the grave and the coffin.

It is clear that Melito contrasts here the various aspects of the Jewish Passover-festival which was always celebrated with great joy[7], and certain features of the Lord's Passion. And one element next to psalm-singing (see note 3) is here *dancing*! From this text we must conclude that the bishop of Sardis knew of a way of Passover-celebration, of which dancing formed a part. It may have been a particularity of the Jews in Asia Minor, about whose religious ceremonies we have no further information; it may be that Melito who visited Palestine (according to Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* IV 26, 13), had seen it there. It is quite feasible that in some Jewish circles the joy of Passover was expressed by dancing, since the festival was held in remembrance of the great exodus and such a dance was mentioned in the story of Exod. 15. One may also compare *Midrash Rabba* on the Song of Songs 7,1:2 "can you provide us with such a dance as was provided for our ancestors by the Red Sea"[8], though this text clearly implies that the author of this saying did not know of such a practice.

However, the testimony of Melito is quite explicit. If it is correct that at his time there was a dance connected with the hymn-singing at the Passover-meal, it may explain the description given in the Acts of John. For the bishop of Sardis and the author of these Acts were contem-

poraries and lived in the same area[9]. The latter also knew of this practice; he used it for his description of the last supper which Jesus held with his disciples, and gave it through the words of the hymn a particular stamp (as Jesus Himself did when He according to the evangelists made the Passover-meal the meal of the "New Covenant").

This text of Melito may account for the origin of this particular feature in the Acts of John. The author did not invent it himself, but derived it from existing practice.

There is still another point which I should like to raise in this connection. In the same passage, quoted before from the *Midrash* on the Song of Songs, one finds a tradition from the 3rd century about an eschatological dance: "Can you furnish for us such a dance as that which the Holy One, blessed be He, will provide for the righteous in the time to come? For R. Berekiah and R. Ḥelbo and 'Ulla of Beri and R. Eleazar in the name of R. Ḥanina[10] said: The Holy One, blessed be He, will in the time to come lead the dance among the righteous, as it says, *Mark ye well her rampart*—helah (Ps. 46:14), where it is written *holah* (her dance); and they will point to Him with the finger, as it says, *For such is God, our God, for ever and ever; He will guide us eternally*—'al muth (*ib.* 15): that is, like maidens (*'alamoth*), like dances of the righteous"[11]. The fact that a variant reading which is not found in the Massoretic text[12] serves as a proof, shows that the idea of this eschatological dance was not derived from the OT text, but that a conception already in existence was afterwards strengthened by biblical testimony. The question may be posed whether there is any connection between this eschatological dance, attested for the first time in the beginning of the 3rd cent., but repeated by various rabbis, and the dancing in the Acts of John, the latter being an anticipation of the future event and typically christianized. I must confess that I have not found a satisfactory answer yet, but hope that the research of one of my pupils, the Rev. K. W. Slik (Rotterdam) will bring more light.

NOTES

* Appeared in: *Vigiliae Christianae* XVIII (1964), p. 1-5.

[1] Translation of M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford 1924, p. 253 f.

[2] V. Taylor, *The Gospel according to St. Mark*, London 1952, p. 548.

[3] H. L. Strack—P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1928, vol. IV 1, p. 41-76.

[4] M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII, Méliton de Sardes, Homélie sur la Pâque*, Cologny-Genève 1960, p. 9-13 on the rediscovery of this important homily in various stages.

[5] C. Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, and Some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel*, London 1940, p. 141-143; M. Testuz, l.c., p. 47-48.

[6] Cf. *Acts of John* 96 "Thou hast me as a bed, rest upon me".

[7] This note is very clear in *Mishna Pesahim* x:5 God "brought us... from sorrow to gladness, and from mourning to a Festival-day" (translation of H. Danby, *The Mishnah*, Oxford 1933, p. 151).

[8] Translation of M. Simon, *Midrash Rabba*, London 1939, vol. IX, p. 276.—One may also compare the famous description of Philo, *De Vita Contemplativa* 84-86 about the dances of the Therapeutai, where it is expressly stated that it was an imitation of the dances at the Red Sea during the exodus. But in this case the dance is not connected with Passover, but with the Feast of Weeks or Pentecost.

[9] On Melito cf. M. Testuz, l.c., p. 7-9; on the "Acts of John" my article 'Johannesakten', in: *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*[3], Tübingen 1959, vol. III, col. 821-822.

[10] The dates of these Rabbis as given in: J. Jeremias-K. Adolph, *Verzeichnis der Schriftgelehrten, Geographisches Register*, in: H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, op. cit., München 1961, vol. VI, are as follows: p. 36 Ḥanina (b. Hama), Palestinian c. 225—p. 27 Berekiah, Palestinian c. 340—p. 39 Ḥelbo, Palestinian c. 300—p. 144 'Ulla of Beri, Babylonian c. 280—p. 50 Eleazar, Palestinian c. 270.

[11] The same tradition is found in *Midrash Rabba*, Leviticus 11:9 (translation of J. Israelstam, London 1939, p. 151) with a small change and addition after (ib. 15): "i.e. with youthfulness, with liveliness. Or '*almuth*' means 'like maidens' ('*alamoth*), as it is written, *In the midst of damsels* ('alamoth) *playing upon timbrels* (ib. 68:26). Aquila translated [the word '*almuth*, Ps. 48:15] *athanasia* [i.e. deathlessness, immortality; i.e. He will lead us to] a world in which there is no death. Or '*almuth*' means two '*olamoth*, i.e. worlds, [the passage meaning], He will lead us in this world, and He will lead us in the World to Come".—Is it out of place here to refer to a text at the end of Clement of Alexandria's *Protreptikos* XII 120:2 where Clement says in the terminology of the mysteries: "If you will, be you also initiated; and you shall dance (χορεύσεις) along with the angels around the unbegotten and destructable and the only true God, while the Word of God sings with us"?

[12] As is correctly remarked by J. Israelstam, l.c., p. 151, n. 3.

AN UNUSUAL FORMULATION OF THE REDEMPTION IN THE HOMILY ON THE PASSION BY MELITO OF SARDIS*

In the very year in which the man to whom this festschrift is dedicated embarked upon his professorial career, that year in which our country fell into the tyrant's grip, there appeared in the free world the *editio princeps* of an early Christian document dating from the latter half of the second century, the Homily on the Pascha by Melito of Sardis[1].

This sermon about the Pascha uses a typological exposition of Israel's liberation from the bondage of Egypt (Exodus 12) to proclaim the decisive, eternal redemption brought by Christ Jesus and calls upon the Jewish people to accept Him, the true Paschal Lamb slain by themselves.

This *anti-doron* offered in gratitude for the many gifts which I myself have received from the man honoured here both in speech and through his writings will deal with one aspect of this sermon. It seemed to me not inappropriate to offer one whose teaching brief encompasses the history of doctrine a contribution derived from this field and to invite one, who has in these past years listened with such immense care to the voices of contemporary bishops, to hear with me the word of an episkopos speaking from the distant past.

Anyone whose special concern is the development of theology in the past few centuries is bound often to feel overwhelmed by the immense volume of the material and wearily to find his way through this profusion; but anyone studying the doctrinal developments in the first centuries of the church's history will time and again bewail the lack of material, which so often makes it impossible to discern more than a vague, thin outline. In the crucial apostolic and sub-apostolic period up to *c.* AD 180 we have a reasonably clear picture in some areas but are groping in the dark in others[2]. Although we may properly take into account the strong links and fairly frequent interchange between the various congregations scattered throughout the vastness of the empire, we should nevertheless be wary of quick generalisations.

The last 25 years have witnessed a not inconsiderable progress precisely in our knowledge of theological development in the second century. First, a number of entirely new sources have become available, the most spectacular discovery being that of the Gnostic library at Nag Hammadi. Secondly, the 'apocryphal' writings at one time dismissed as valueless have in fact turned out to yield priceless data. Whatever one thinks of the main thesis and argument of Martin Werner's *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*[3], it must be granted that he was methodologically

wholly justified in including the New Testament apocrypha in his study. We ought, therefore, to be grateful that this scattered material has now been made readily accessible in the well-ordered new edition by Hennecke-Schneemelcher[4]. Thirdly, new interpretations of authors already known to us, such as the Apologists, made in the light of contemporary streams of thought[5] are opening up several new perspectives. There is now a primary need for thoroughly detailed commentaries, but these are as yet not available. Because the data are often very piecemeal and seldom appear to yield very much at first glance, we shall need the skill of a detective at making deductions and combinations in order to make any progress with this material. In this area it is also true that words sensitively heard and interpreted may have more to say than was consciously intended. We must moreover undertake the difficult task after centuries to reconstruct the milieu in which things were said whose meaning would have been immediately clear to contemporary ears but whose point escapes us. If we are not to fall victim to premature and therefore incorrect syntheses, then a great deal of detailed analytical work needs first to be undertaken.

Among the surprising discoveries of new sources was also the Homily on the Pascha by Melito of Sardis. The history of this discovery has a curious side to it. Up to 1920 only a few fragments of this work were extant[6]; but after Bonner's publication quite a number of corroborating documents interestingly came to light. Testuz published a second manuscript in 1960 and H. Chadwick a Latin epitome[7], whilst it became known about the same time that the work also exists in a Coptic translation[8]. Thus this sermon which was regarded 25 years ago as effectively lost to us is now known through many witnesses. These also show how highly this work from Melito's pen was valued, an impression which is strengthened when we note the following which he had[9]. Such has been the number of witnesses who have all at once appeared, that one could wish that some of this testimony had borne upon the many other works by Melito, which we only know of by name[10]. However, even if this is not the case now, who is to know what surprise may yet lie in store for us in this field?

Melito enjoyed considerable authority among his contemporaries in the second century. According to Tertullian he was regarded as a prophet "a plerisque nostrorum"[11]; the author of the so-called "Little Labyrinth" mentions him beside Irenaeus as one of the witnesses, that Jesus Christ is "God and man"[12], and Polycrates writing to Victor of Rome speaks of him as one of the great lights of Asia[13]. If we remember, moreover, how important a centre of Christian activity Asia Minor was at that time, then we begin to realise that the reputation of its author and

the time and place of its origin make this sermon an important document of early Christian theology.

It is not necessary for our purpose to pursue the argument of the bishop of Sardis step by step. It will be sufficient to mention that this preacher after paraphrasing the account of the institution of the Passover (Exod. 12) lays special emphasis on the last plague, the destruction of the first-born in Egypt and on the protection enjoyed by Israel through the blood smeared on their doorposts, type of the blood of Christ. Following a familiar early Christian etymology *Pascha* is derived from *paschein* = to suffer; the mystery of the Pascha is that the Lord came down to earth to share the suffering of the suffering one and "having clothed himself with the suffering one ..carry him off to the heights of heaven" (par. 47). This is then expanded in a sweeping description of the terrible moral consequences of the Fall and its issue in death, whereby the beautiful unity between body and soul was broken apart. "This, then, is the reason why the mystery of the Pascha has been fulfilled in the body of the Lord" (par. 56); this had already been prefigured in the suffering of the OT patriarchs and predicted by the prophets (par. 57-65). In the introduction to the passage which we want particularly to discuss mention is made of the incarnation:" It is he who.....coming forth a man, accepted the sufferings of the suffering one through the body which was able to suffer, and dissolved the sufferings of the flesh; and by the Spirit which could not die he killed death the killer of men" (par. 66). After that the redemption is described in the following terms:

§ 67 A οὗτος γὰρ ὡς ἀμνὸς ἀχθεὶς
καὶ ὡς πρόβατον σφαγεὶς[14]
ἐλυτρώσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ κόσμου ἀπωλείας
ὡς ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου
καὶ ἔλυσεν ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς τοῦ διαβόλου δουλείας
ὡς ἐκ χειρὸς Φαραώ,
καὶ ἐσφράγισεν ἡμῶν τὰς ψυχὰς τῷ ἰδίῳ πνεύματι
καὶ τὰ μέλη τοῦ σώματος τῷ ἰδίῳ αἵματι.

§ 68 B οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὸν θάνατον ἐνδύσας αἰσχύνην
καὶ τὸν διάβολον δήσας πενθήρη
ὡς Μωυσῆς τὸν Φαραώ.

C οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ τὴν ἀνομίαν πατάξας
καὶ τὴν ἀδικίαν ἀτεκνώσας
ὡς Μωυσῆς Αἴγυπτον.

D οὗτός ἐστιν ὁ ῥυσάμενος ἡμᾶς
ἐκ δουλείας εἰς ἐλευθερίαν
ἐκ σκότους εἰς φῶς

ἐκ θανάτου εἰς ζωήν
ἐκ τυραννίδος εἰς βασίλειαν αἰώνιον[15]
§ 69 E οὗτός ἐστιν τὸ πάσχα τῆς σωτηρίας ἡμῶν[16].

This is followed by seven statements about Jesus: his suffering in OT figures[17], his life, his being the Lamb, each statement introduced with the words οὗτός ἐστιν. Thus we find here twelve sayings in all about the person and work of Jesus, not free from repetition, all beginning with the same words. The number, it seems to me, was not chosen at random, though Melito does not 'play' around with this any further. The repeated "This is he..." lends the passage A as a whole a solemn tone. Time and again it illustrates the truth that Jesus is the true Paschal Lamb, who brought not temporal but eternal redemption (see the opening of the homily, e.g. par. 3)[18].

While the structure of this passage is deliberately chosen and built up, there appears to be no sign of a logical development with which the preacher works towards a climax. Instead we find that the first part of the passage, quoted above in full, is closely linked to the theme of the sermon, i.e. Israel's exodus out of Egypt, while the second part which we summarised above is derived much more from the Christian confession about Jesus. In the first group of sayings the work of Christ is to the fore, in the latter His person; in the former redemption, in the latter the Redeemer.

A closer look reveals, that the statements in A, B and C correspond directly to the exposition Melito gives of the story of Exodus 12. A direct relationship is forged by the mention of Egypt, Pharaoh and Moses[19]. The history of the night of the Passover is treated typologically:
A. The deliverance from slavery and the protection against destruction afforded by the blood are treated in parr. 11-16 and 30-32;
B. the shame and the grief surrounding Pharaoh are described in parr. 17-20;
C. the death of Egypt's firstborn is depicted at length in parr. 21-29.

It should further be noted that the typology in B contains an allusion to Christ's *Descensus ad inferos*, a theme to which Melito returns in par. 102[20], and that the angel of death in C is taken as a type of Christ, which should be seen against the background of the angel-christology current in the second century[21]. Also striking is the dramatic passion with which Melito paints the death of the firstborn and the mourning of Egypt; these are described in tremendous detail, while the deliverance of Israel is by contrast only touched upon briefly.

When we have seen the preacher paint the consequences of Adam's fall with a wealth of lurid detail (parr. 48-56), we begin to understand the

background to words such as ἀπώλεια, διάβολος, θάνατος, ἀνομία and ἀδικία and how easily the story of the Passover lent itself to this kind of typology.

While the connection with and application of the account in Exodus 12 are thus evident in A, B and C, and while the allusion to Paul's words in 1 Cor. 5:7 in E is crystal clear and underlined by the use of the word Pascha itself[22], the point of contact is not given *expressis verbis* in the fourth statement, D.

In terms of content D finds a strong parallel in A. Yet, what makes these words about deliverance so important is the fact that unlike the preceding statements, in which the foreground is occupied by negative elements (the power from which man is freed), here the positive element (the new state into which we are liberated) comes to the fore.

In terms of structure D also diverges from the other statements. The form with its four strictly parallel sub-divisions is very striking and raises the question of origin. Where does it come from? Is this the invention of the author whose style shows a clear predilection for the use of contrast and, if so, only to be valued as an example of his rhetorical skill[23]? A counterpart is to be found in his description of the "inheritance" left to his descendants by Adam:

§ 49 οὐχ ἁγνείαν ἀλλὰ πορνείαν,
οὐκ ἀφθαρσίαν ἀλλὰ φθοράν,
οὐ τιμὴν ἀλλὰ ἀτιμίαν,
οὐκ ἐλευθερίαν ἀλλὰ δουλείαν,
οὐ βασιλείαν ἀλλὰ τυραννίδα,
οὐ ζωὴν ἀλλὰ θάνατον,
οὐ σωτηρίαν ἀλλὰ ἀπώλειαν.

Although more examples of this antithetical style could be adduced, this particular passage has been cited because its sevenfold description of the consequences of Adam's fall is virtually the negative counterpart of the positive words in par. 68. We will return to this later.

What is more, a comparison of Melito's statements concerning the deliverance of Israel with other typological interpretations of the Exodus story shows that the latter resemble A, B and C rather than D. In his *Dialogue with Trypho* CXI 3-4 Justin Martyr too refers to the death of the firstborn in Egypt, while Israel was protected by the blood of the lamb smeared on the doorposts: οὕτως καὶ τοὺς πιστεύσαντας ῥύσεται ἐκ θανάτου τὸ αἷμα τοῦ χριστοῦ..... προεκήρυσσε τὴν μέλλουσαν δι' αἵματος τοῦ χριστοῦ γενήσεσθαι σωτηρίαν τῷ γένει τῶν ἀνθρώπων[24]. Irenaeus also (*Epideixis* XXV) emphasises the plagues, esp. the last plague inflicted upon Egypt because

of their oppression of the Israelites: "From this he saved the children of Israel, showing forth in a mystery the Passion of Christ, by the immolation of a spotless lamb, and by its blood, given as a guarantee of immunity to be smeared on the houses of the Hebrews, and the name of this mystery is the Passover, source of freedom"[25]. In ch. XLVI of the same work Irenaeus speaks of the Son of God: "He it was, who was mounting and descending for the deliverance of the afflicted, taking us out of the dominion of the Egyptians, that is, out of every idolatry and impiety"[26]. Alongside these texts from the second century[27] we may also place some motifs from a later period. In the pseudo-Hippolytan Paschal Homily Egypt is also seen as a type of idolatry and the deliverance as a type of the liberation from slavery to sin[28]. For Aphraates the Jews escaped from slavery under Pharaoh's yoke, while "we were redeemed from the bondage of Satan on the day of the crucifixion"[29]. In the Baptismal Catechesis of Cyril of Jerusalem the parallel is drawn between Moses, who led the people out of bondage, and Christ, who was sent into the world, ἵνα ῥύσηται τοὺς ἐν τῷ κόσμῳ ὑπὸ τῆς ἁμαρτίας καταπονουμένους, and between the blood of the lamb, which gave protection from the angel of death, and the blood of Christ, which drove the demons to flight[30].

This comparison indicates that the interpretations ran along generally similar lines, although there was no fixed tradition in the terminology used; a certain amount of variety can be seen in the descriptions of the power of evil, one interesting instance being that Melito makes no mention of idolatry.

. We can of course find the general sense of the motifs of D reflected in the story of Exodus 12, although it is odd that the "slavery" already mentioned in A is repeated here, while there is no mention of the blood of the lamb. A further puzzling feature is the source of the last part. It is possible to point out that this is in effect a transformation of promise into fulfilment of the words in Exodus 6:6-7:

> ἐγώ κύριος καὶ ἐξάξω ὑμᾶς ἀπὸ τῆς δυναστείας τῶν Αἰγυπτίων καὶ ῥύσομαι ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῆς δουλείας καὶ λυτρώσομαι ὑμᾶς ἐν βραχίονι ὑψηλῷ καὶ κρίσει μεγάλῃ. καὶ λήμψομαι ἐμαυτῷ ὑμᾶς λαὸν ἐμοὶ καὶ ἔσομαι ὑμῶν θεός, καὶ γνώσεσθε ὅτι ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ὁ ἐξαγαγὼν ὑμᾶς ἐκ τῆς καταδυναστείας τῶν Αἰγυπτίων.

But here too there is such a difference both in terminology and formulation that the question needs to be pursued further.

Blank drew attention to some New Testament texts, namely Colossians 1:15: ὃς ἐρρύσατο ἡμᾶς ἐκ τῆς ἐξουσίας τοῦ σκότους καὶ μετέστησεν εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ υἱοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ. John 5:24: "he who gives heed to

what I say and puts his trust in Him who sent me..... μεταβέβηκεν ἐκ τοῦ θανάτου εἰς τὴν ζωήν'' (cf. 1 John 3:14). One could add 1 Peter 2:9: τοῦ ἐκ σκότους ὑμᾶς καλέσαντος εἰς τὸ θαυμαστὸν αὐτοῦ φῶς. According to Blank the background of our text is to be found in baptism: ''In Verbindung mit dem Taufgeschehen wird die Rede von diesem neuen Exodus erst voll verständlich''[31]. It is hard to see why this is necessarily so. There is sometimes a tendency to be too quick to spot allusions to liturgy. If the theme were the crossing of the Red Sea, it would be quite a different matter, as that is regularly used in connection with baptism in early Christian typology[32]. But in our text the primary thought is of the sacrifice of the Paschal Lamb and its effect. The same must be said of the New Testament texts cited by Blank as was said above of the Old Testament quotations. There are moreover certain parallels both in *form* and in *content* which have as yet remained unnoticed, which are very telling; these do not refer to baptism but to the Pascha.

Before we discuss these, however, it will prove worthwhile to pursue the question of the real background to Melito's statement a little further. We have already noticed the description he gives of the consequences of the Fall. But, although this is structurally a well rounded unity, the preacher is not content with this passage, but continues into a detailed drawing of the disastrous consequences of Adam's death. This elaboration is as far as I know only found in Melito. The whole emphasis here falls on the moral degradation among mankind with a special accent on sexual corruption. Striking parallels can be found in this extensive description (parr. 50-56) to the so-called Lasterkataloge[33], but it is curious to find that the rejection of God and the sin of idolatry, which both in the *Wisdom of Solomon* 14:24-27 and in Paul's letter to the Romans 1:21ff. are the cause of all this misery, are not mentioned by Melito. This is all the more striking, because Egypt is often the symbol of idolatry and magic in early Christian literature and because, as we have already seen, the typology of the Exodus also tended in that direction. Although it would be too much to discuss this passage in full detail in order to trace the cause of this unusual description, I do want to draw attention to just one feature. In several places Melito uses the word ''Tyranny'' and fills it out by telling how fathers killed sons, sons killed parents and friends murdered one another. This reminds us of the eschatological words of Jesus in Mark 13:12, Mt. 10:35, Luke 12:53 with the allusion to Micah 7:6[34]. The arresting fact here is that Melito does not quote the words either as a prediction of the future or as visibly fulfilled in his own time but sees this drama as present from the beginning of history. In this connection I want to point out an interesting parallel which has so far escaped notice: in Dio Chrysostom's *Oratio* I 76 there is a description of

the choice facing Heracles between *Basileia* (true kingship) and *Tyrannis* (the false dominion of the tyrant) and one of the first marks of Tyranny is: φονεύοντες οἱ ταλαίπωροι, παῖδές τε γονεῦσι πολλάκις ἐπιβουλεύοντες καὶ γονεῖς παισὶ καὶ ἀδελφοὶ ἀδελφοῖς. The characteristics of the "tyrant" painted elsewhere[35] provide further striking similarities with Melito's description of the moral chaos of the world. Typical motifs drawn both from the Bible and from Hellenistic culture here mingle together, all serving the purpose of depicting the corruption of God's mankind. The background to the liberation "from tyranny to the kingdom" is to be found here and is not directly drawn from the Exodus story.

In the same passage (parr. 55-56) we are told how man is being divided by death; what was taken from the earth was dissolved into the earth[36] and what was given by God, the soul, was shut up in Hades. But restoration is given in the death of Christ, in His descent into hell and in His resurrection:

par. 102 ἐγὼ ὁ καταλύσας τὸν θάνατον
καὶ θριαμβεύσας τὸν ἐχθρὸν
καὶ καταπατήσας τὸν ᾅδην
καὶ δήσας τὸν ἰσχυρὸν
καὶ καθορμίσας[37] τὸν ἄνθρωπον
εἰς τὰ ὕψη τῶν οὐρανῶν.

With exactly this passage concerning the transition from death to life in our formula we come to an interesting parallel in the so-called *Epistula Apostolorum*. It is difficult to date and locate this interesting work from the second half of the second century more precisely[38], though it is not impossible that it comes from Asia Minor. In a discussion there between Jesus and his disciples about the resurrection of the flesh, which was clearly a matter for serious debate, the Lord asks the disciples whether they believe that His words will come to pass. When they reply in the affirmative, Jesus says:

"Wahrlich, ich sage euch, dass ich alle Gewalt von meinem
Vater empfangen habe, damit ich
die in Finsternis Befindlichen ins Licht zurückführe
und die in Vergänglichkeit Befindlichen in die Unvergänglichkeit
und die im Irrtum Befindlichen in die Gerechtichkeit[39]
und *die im Tode Befindlichen ins Leben*
und damit die in Gefangenschaft Befindlichen entfesselt werden,
wie das, was von seiten der Menschen unmöglich ist,
von seiten des Vaters möglich ist"[40].

The similarity in form between this passage and Melito's is obvious. There are direct parallels in two of the lines. The context of this statement makes the meaning perfectly plain; it is a promise of the resurrection of the dead wherein Jesus rescues men from the power of death. However, we might well ask whether this was the original setting of this statement, because the Words "die im Irrtum Befindlichen in die Gerechtichkeit" don't readily fit the context of resurrection. Are we to look elsewhere for its origin?

The question becomes more pressing still when we take note of a non-Christian parallel which would appear particularly significant precisely in view of Melito's subject-matter.

In the Mishnah Tractate *Pesachim* x 5 we find the well-known words recited by the Jews through the ages on the evening of Seder.

"Therefore we are bound to thank, praise, laud, glorify, extol, declare victorious and magnify[41] Him, who wrought all these wondrous deeds for us and led us out

from slavery to freedom,
from misery to joy,
from sorrow to a feastday,
from darkness to a great light,
and from serfdom to redemption"[42].

The text is not entirely fixed; some editions only give the first line[43]. But this does not necessarily mean that the following lines are a later addition, as it is not uncommon in liturgical texts to find only the opening words given. Strack is of the opinion that this passage is early because of the discussion between the schools of Shammai and Hillel in the immediately following par. 6[44]. The text was in any case known in the time of Melito because it already appeared in the Mishnah.

There are in my view other indications that the bishop of Sardis was familiar with the Jewish celebration of the Passover not only through the Old Testament but also from contemporary practice. One thinks for example of par. 80, where the joyfulness of the Jews' Passover feast is described in detail and contrasted with the sufferings of Jesus[45]. One can also point out that the three ingredients which form, according to Gamaliel, the heart of the Paschal Festival, namely Pascha, bitter herbs and mazza are also to be found in Melito. For in this saying of Gamaliel (M. *Pesachim* x 5) we learn: "Pascha, because God passed over the houses of our fathers in Egypt; Merorim (bitter herbs), because the Egyptians made life bitter for our fathers in Egypt; Mazza, because our fathers were rescued from Egypt"[46]. In his sermon Melito lays great emphasis on Pascha (parr. 46-47), though in line with a familiar Greek exegesis[47] the

word is connected with *paschein* = to suffer[48], while he speaks at great length in par. 93 of the bitterness which Israel inflicted on its Lord. For a reference to the "deliverance" one can point to the text under discussion here, as ὁ ῥυσάμενος is in several places in the LXX the rendering of גאל[49].

The parallel both in form and in content between this text in the Mishnah about the Passover and Melito is therefore very striking. Though, as we have already noted, Melito does not explicitly mention the similarity with the Exodus story, his formulation fits in completely with the Passover ritual of the time and has clearly been derived from there. In the process the Jewish Passover words have been adapted to the Christian festival. Two points need to be noted.

a) The festive note has been omitted from the Jewish formulation. This is understandable if we recall, as Lohse has in my view demonstrated convincingly, that penitence for Israel was at that time a dominant note[50] in Quartodeciman circles.

b) In accordance with the design of Melito's sermon, which is built up on a framework of "type reality", this formulation is transformed and made to speak of the redemptive work of Christ, who delivers men from the power of sin and death.

The similarity between the formulation in *Pesachim* x 5 and Melito is such that I venture to conclude that Melito is drawing on the Jewish Passover ritual. It is in my view from this picture of deliverance that the account of the state from which men are delivered has been drawn (par. 49) by backprojection. From the similarity with the passage in the *Epistula Apostolorum* cited above I believe we may further conclude that this formulation was current in a number of variations and could in fact be employed to describe the conversion from paganism to Christianity ("from error into righteousness"), just as the exodus from Egypt was interpreted by the presbyters of the second century as a picture of this conversion from paganism. To what extent this formulation might already have influenced Christian theology in the New Testament period, e.g. in the connection in Paul between "freedom" and the death of Jesus Christ or in Col. 1:13, is a question beyond the scope of this enquiry.

I trust that the discussion of this formulation of redemption may have underlined the necessity of detailed interpretation of the sparse theological data available to us from the second century and also the surprising connections that can come to light in such an investigation. And, precisely because the second century is of fundamental importance for the subsequent development of theology, such work must be regarded as one of the most important areas of research in the field of the history of doctrine.

NOTES

* The original of this article is to be found in: *Ex Auditu Verbi* (jubilee volume presented to Prof. Dr. G. C. Berkouwer), Kampen 1965, p. 297-311.

[1] C. Bonner, *The Homily on the Passion by Melito, Bishop of Sardis, and Some Fragments of the Apocryphal Ezekiel* (in: *Studies and Documents XII*), London-Philadelphia 1940.—In the light of our present-day knowledge the views of P. Nautin, who argued against authorship by Melito, need no longer be considered worthy of serious discussion.

[2] The most notorious example is that of the history of the church and of doctrine in Egypt up to approx. AD 180.

[3] M. Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, Leipzig-Bern 1941.

[4] E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher (edd.), *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, Tübingen 1959-1964, 2 volumes.

[5] See for instance C. Andresen, 'Justin und der mittlere Platonismus', in: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* XLIV (1952-1953), p. 157-195.

[6] For this see J. C. Th. von Otto, *Corpus Apologetarum christianorum saeculi secundi*, vol. IX, Jena, 1872, pp. 374-378, 497-511 (Syriac fragments with a Latin translation); B. P. Grenfell-A. S. Hunt, *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri* XIII London 1919, pp. 19-21 (Greek fragment); W. E. Crum-H. I. Bell, *Coptica* III, Copenhagen 1922, pp. 47-49 (Coptic fragment identified in 1939 by C. Bonner, 'A Coptic Fragment of Melito's Homily on the Passion', in: *Harvard Theological Review* XXXII (1939), pp. 141-142).

[7] M. Testuz, *Papyrus Bodmer XIII, Méliton de Sardes, Homélie sur la Pâque*, Cologne-Genève 1960; H. Chadwick, 'A Latin Epitome of Melito's Homily on the Pascha', in: *The Journal of Theological Studies*, New Series XI (1960), pp. 76-82.

[8] See Testuz, op. cit., pp. 11-12.

[9] In support of this see the survey in Bonner, op. cit., pp. 56-72.

[10] Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History* IV 26:2; compare with this A. Harnack *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur, I, Die Überlieferung und der Bestand*, Leipzig 1893, pp. 246-255.

[11] In a lost work mentioned by Jerome, *De Viris Inlustribus* 24.

[12] In Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* V 28:5.

[13] Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.* V 24:5.

[14] cf. Is. 53:7, also quoted in par. 64.

[15] In the manuscript used by Bonner and Lohse (see note 16) the following addition appears at this point:

καὶ ποιήσας ἡμᾶς ἱεράτευμα καινὸν
καὶ λαὸν περιούσιον αἰώνιον

In the manuscript from the Bodmer collection edited by Testuz these words do not appear nor are they found in the Latin excerpt (ed. H. Chadwick, op. cit., p. 78). The witness of the Latin text is in no way weakened by the fact that it is an excerpt, because whoever made this excerpt clearly regarded the passage of considerable importance, as appears from the fact that throughout this passage he follows the original text with meticulous care. The addition, following as it does on 'kingdom', is likely to have been made under the influence of Exodus 19:5-6; cf. 1 Peter 2:9 and Rev. 1:6. The argument for an omission could be based on the possibility of homoioteleuton (αἰώνιον). On the whole the case for regarding this as an addition would seem the stronger. As things stand at present, this problem of textual criticism cannot be resolved unambiguously. As we are primarily concerned with the fourfold formula in D, this uncertainty need not exercise us unduly.

[16] In the presentation of this text I am following the lay-out to be found in B. Lohse's edition in *Die Passa-Homilie des Bischofs Meliton von Sardes*, Leiden 1958 (Textus Minores, vol. XXIV); the rhetorical character of this work is here also demonstrated by the typography.
The capitals, A, B, C, D, are introduced by me in order to simplify references to the various sections in the discussion.

[17] A virtually identical list of OT types is to be found in par. 59.

[18] E. Norden's remarks about οὗτός ἐστιν in his *Agnostos Theos*, Leipzig 1913, pp. 187-188, do not shed any significant light on this formula.

[19] Likewise in par. 60 ἀπόβλεψον δὲ καὶ εἰς τὸν ἐν γῇ Αἰγύπτου πρόβατον σφαζόμενον
τὸν πατάξαντα Αἴγυπτον
καὶ σώσαντα τὸν Ἰσραὴλ
διὰ τοῦ αἵματος.

[20] Cf. B. Reicke, 'Höllenfahrt Christi, I,' in: *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart* (3rd ed.), Tübingen 1959, vol. III, col. 408-410 and the literature listed there; not mentioned there but of real importance for the history of this motif in the early Church is C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, Leipzig 1919, Excursus II, 'Der *Descensus ad inferos* in der alten Kirche', pp. 453-576.

[21] See W. Michaelis, *Zur Engelchristologie im Urchristentum*, Basel 1942, *passim.*

[22] For the phrase πάσχα τῆς σωτηρίας see B. Lohse, *Das Passah-Fest der Quartodecimaner*, Gütersloh 1953, p. 55.

[23] A. Wifstrand, 'The Homily of Melito on the Passion', in: *Vigiliae Christianae* II (1948), pp. 201-223.

[24] It should be noticed at this point that Justin is speaking of a future deliverance (the verbs are in the future tense). He furnishes a different explanation in his *Dialogue with Trypho*, XL 1-3.

[25] According to the translation from the Armenian by J. P. Smith, *St. Irenaeus, Proof of the Apostolic Preaching*, Westminster (Maryland)-London 1952, p. 64.

[26] J. P. Smith, op. cit., p. 77.

[27] The history of the Exodus receives a somewhat different interpretation from Irenaeus' precursors, the Presbyters cited by him; see Irenaeus *Adversus Haereses* IV 30:4 *universa enim quae ex Aegypto profectio fiebat populi a deo, typus et imago fuit profectionis ecclesiae, quae erat futura ex gentibus*—i.e. the reference is to the departure from among the heathen.

[28] P. Nautin, *Homélies Pascales I. Une homélie inspirée du traité sur la pâque d'Hippolyte*, Paris 1950, p. 161.

[29] Aphraates, *Demonstratio XII De Paschate* 8.

[30] Cyril of Jerusalem, *Catech. Myst.* I 3.

[31] T. Blank, *Meliton von Sardes, Vom Passa, die älteste christliche Osterpredigt*, Freiburg i. Br. 1963, p. 75.—It is not really possible to understand this as a baptismal sermon, as it is not so much directed at those about to be baptised as to unconverted Jews; they are addressed directly and urgently from par. 73 onwards. It should also be noted in this connection that "light" in Melito's thinking refers not to baptism but to the Gospel. (The connection with Exod. 10:23 is misunderstood where Bonner op. cit. interprets συνεφωτίζετο in par. 30 as 'baptise'.)

[32] Cf. P. Lundberg, *La typologie baptismale dans l'ancienne église* Leipzig-Upssala 1942.

[33] Cf. A. Vögtle, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im Neuen Testament*, Münster i. W. 1936; S. Wibbing, *Die Tugend- und Lasterkataloge im neuen Testament*, Berlin 1959.

[34] A well-known parallel is to be found in *Mishnah Sota* IX 15; see also P. Volz, *Die Eschatologie der jüdischen Gemeinde im neutestamentlichen Zeitalter*, 2nd ed., Tübingen 1934, p. 159 ff.

[35] See R. Höistad, *Cynic Hero and Cynic King*, Uppsala 1948, p. 179 ff. and index, p. 226 s.v. '*tyranny*', '*tyrant*'.

[36] Cf. Genesis 3:19.

[37] Codex Bodmer: ἀφαρπάσας.

[38] Normally Egypt or Asia Minor is thought to be the place of origin: see e.g. R. Schütz, 'Epistula Apostolorum', in: *R.G.G.*, 3rd. ed., vol. II, col. 533; I am personally inclined to favour the theory of origins in Asia Minor.

[39] This line is omitted in M. R. James' translation, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford 1924, p. 493 without any explanation.

[40] *Epistula Apostolorum* 21 (32) as translated by H. Duensing in E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen in deutscher Übersetzung*, 3rd. ed., Tübingen 1959, vol. I, p. 138—This quotation from Mark 10:27 and parallels is frequently used in early Christian literature with reference to the resurrection; see 1 *Clement* 27:2, Justin, *Apol.* XIX, Athenagoras, *De Resurrectione* IX, Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* V 3:2-5, Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Carnis* LVII, *Apoc. Petri* (eth. text) in James, op. cit., p. 512, Celsus apud Origines, *Contra Celsum* V 14.

[41] Cf. with this opening *Martyrdom of Polycarp* XIV 3: διὰ τοῦτο καὶ περὶ πάντων σὲ αἰνῶ, σὲ εὐλογῶ, σὲ δοξάζω.

[42] Text translated from that in H. L. Strack, *Pesachim*, Leipzig 1911, p. 29*.

[43] As for instance in G. Beer, *Pesachim*, Giessen 1912, p. 196 and cf. the critical apparatus in H. L. Strack, op. cit., p. 29*.

[44] H. L. Strack, op. cit., p. 33, n. 20.

[45] Cf. my article, 'A Note on the Dance of Jesus in the 'Acts of John'', in: *Vigiliae Christianae* XVIII (1964), p. 2f. [see above p. 144f.].

[46] This is an allusion to Exodus 12:39.—It is not clear which Gamaliel is speaking here, but his words mirror a practice which was known in Melito's day.

[47] See C. Mohrmann, 'Pascha, Passio, Transitus', in: *Ephemerides Liturgicae* LXVI (1952), p. 37 ff.; also the note in Bonner, op. cit., p. 115 and B. Lohse, op. cit., p. 53.

[48] Nevertheless Melito is not unaware of the thought that the houses of the Israelites were spared—see e.g. par. 30.

[49] As in Isaiah 44:6; 47:4; 48:17, 20; 49:7; 54:5 and 8.

[50] B. Lohse, op. cit., p. 62 ff.

GNOSTICA

THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED *GOSPEL OF TRUTH* AND THE NEW TESTAMENT*

Two independent discoveries in the last decade are already recognized to be of great importance for the historian of primitive Christianity. Their significance, indeed, is likely to increase still more as time passes. In 1945 peasants in the neighbourhood of Nag Hammadi in Upper Egypt found a number of Coptic manuscripts which were apparently the library of a Gnostic sect. In 1947 a chance discovery lifted for the first time a corner of the veil which for 2,000 years had hidden the existence of a Jewish group on the shores of the Dead Sea. If the latter find has provided us with a valuable body of new facts about the religious life of Palestine shortly before and after the beginning of the Christian era and thus contributed, in a way that none could foresee, to a clearer grasp of the conditions in which Christianity grew up, the Egyptian library has put into our hands authentic sources of Gnosis which are of inestimable value for a better knowledge of a great current of spiritual life with which Christianity, in its earliest years as it grew towards a World Church, came into contact. The extent, nature and importance of these discoveries is nothing less than sensational, notably because they were not in the first place the fruit of diligent investigation, but as it were gifts of fortune.

From the moment that the discoveries in the neighbourhood of the Dead Sea were made, they attracted much attention by reason of the nature of the documents, which are partly Old Testament MSS., partly wholly unknown works. The systematic investigation of the site, which is bringing many surprises[1], and the intensive study of such items as have so far been published, have both been a powerful stimulus to this interest. The stream of literature on the subject has already expanded to a boundless flood. But with the find at Nag Hammadi it has been otherwise. After the first publications of the French student, M. Doresse, chiefly in the *Vigiliae Christianae*[2], there appeared a "premier inventaire et essai d'identification" by Professor Henri Charles Puech in *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*[3], and then silence. The MSS., with a single exception, apparently made their way to a museum at Cairo and became for the present inaccessible for publication, study and research. The details set out in the admirable survey of Puech were tantalizing and tormenting. The fruit was visible, but unattainable. How tantalizing the situation is becomes clear if we consider that a library of forty-four completely unknown writings on Gnosticism has been restored to us. I will proceed to outline the situation in greater detail.

(1) From the works of various Christian writers between the second and the fourth centuries it was known that primitive Christianity in this period, and especially in the second century, was forced to fight a great battle—in view of the fierceness of the conflict, we might say a life and death struggle—against a succession of adversaries known as "Gnostics". A multitude of names is recorded and all kinds of systems are described in which lofty speculations and crass magic appear side by side. The resulting information, however, was extremely small, because the writings of the Gnostics themselves were virtually lost and hence their own account of the facts was wanting. To what extent is the witness of their opponents trustworthy? Are they complete in what they tell us? In view of what is common practice in controversy, it was necessary as a preliminary to consider such questions. The number of authentic sources, certainly as far as concerns the second century, is extremely small and they are capable of the most varied interpretation. Since Lidzbarski translated a large part of the Mandaean writings *c.* 1920 and the discovery of the *Manichaica* at the beginning of the 'thirties, these Eastern branches of the stream have become better known. But it still remains an unanswered question how far we can consider these late, and in part very late, sources as reliable testimony to an earlier stage.

To-day, now that documents have come to light from the second century, one of which, the *Apocryphon Johannis*, was certainly used by Irenaeus[4] and others are mentioned by Porphyry[5], it becomes possible to see the situation in much clearer focus. We can put to the test the accuracy of the reports of their opponents and reconstruct the development and ramifications of the systems. In short, "Gnosis as a World-Religion" (*Gnosis als Weltreligion*), as it has been described by Dr. Quispel[6], now receives a much more concrete form. It also becomes possible to see what it was that really characterized this "knowledge" (γνῶσις), for a satisfactory answer to this question, which is of many kinds, has hitherto never been given.

(2) It is clear that Gnosticism was not exclusively a variant, or as we might say a heresy, *within* Christianity. There was an extra-Christian, and possibly also a pre-Christian, Gnosis. But did all this Gnosis issue from a single source? Is it possible everywhere to find the same basic structure underlying it? Are the antiheretical writers correct when they regard Simon Magus (Acts 8) as the "founder" of it all? What was the significance of this Samaritan? Of the Ophites ("Naassenes", i.e. "worshippers of the serpent")? Can they be put in a single class with such completely different groups as the Valentinians, the *Odes of Solomon*, the *Pistis Sophia* and the extra-Christian *Hermetica*—to mention only a few? De Zwaan long ago protested against this[7], but without success. It now

appears that his contention is justified and will receive added support from the connexions of Gnosis with heretical Jewish currents[8]. It is surely fundamentally erroneous, in disregard of chronology, to confuse data whose origins are different, to collect facts from here, there and everywhere and to combine them into a single picture as happens much too frequently. We should remember the good Dutch proverb which says *Er meer gelijk dan eigen is*[9]. The mutual relations within the comprehensive phenomenon which is covered by the term "Gnosticism", as well as its relations to Eastern magic and to Greek philosophy, need definition, and this the new sources promise to make possible for the first time.

(3) The new sources will also throw light on an extensive area of the religious life in the Roman Imperial Age. As a result of all kinds of spiritual crises a religious renaissance of great importance took place in the second and third centuries. It was in this *milieu* that Christianity developed, confronted with which it had to defend its own character, to which it had to set forth an account of its creed, and by which it was also influenced. It was further the sphere in which, to name another influential current, Neo-Platonism grew up; Gnosticism was a current of thought which Plotinus expressly attacked in his *Enneads* II. As far as Christianity itself is concerned, it can be proved that developments of a very far-reaching kind took place in the second century. What was the road which led from the New Testament communities to the "primitive Catholic Church" at the end of the second century, with its ministry, its canon, its doctrine and its liturgy? To a large extent this road would seem to proceed through a tunnel. Eusebius's *Church History*, e.g., shows how much has been lost. Everything which can in any way contribute to the clarification of these contours is of value. It now becomes possible to appreciate more clearly the significance of such writings as the *Acta Thomae* and the *Acta Johannis* which when described as "apocrypha" are hardly assessed at their proper worth, since they show us the character of "vulgar Christianity" and heresy, and enable us the better to understand the background, origin and development of religious conceptions by such men as Clement of Alexandria and Origen.

(4) Since the investigations of Reitzenstein and Bousset, much has been said and written about the influence of Gnosticism on the New Testament and especially on St. Paul and St. John. It is often possible to point to striking parallels, especially if we neglect chronology in the way mentioned above. There is also an inclination to consider everything that has a dualistic ring as "Gnostic" and the question whether these parallels are *real* agreements should make us somewhat shy of accepting the correctness of this thesis without question. It is possible—indeed, very probable—that the better knowledge of Gnosis as a whole which the

discoveries at Nag Hammadi will give us—possibly in conjunction with the doctrines of the Jewish sect near the Dead Sea, which also offer some striking parallels[10]—will put these questions in a new light and that the interpretation of certain New Testament writings, as well as of such writers as Ignatius and 2 Clement, will be carried a stage further.

All this, however, is ... "music of the future", for as yet the wall which guards the discovery of the *Gnostica* has not been penetrated. With one exception, however. What has just been said no longer applies to a Codex which made its way out of Egypt and by strange paths finally *via* Utrecht reached Zürich. In the middle of November 1953, some facts about it were disclosed in two articles published by Dr. H. C. Puech and Prof. G. Quispel in the *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*[11]. This provisional report was followed in February of this year by a detailed scientific discussion in *Vigiliae Christianae*. The original plan was—it is perhaps worth noting the fact—that this discussion should also have appeared in November 1953, before the report in the newspapers, but the strikes in France last summer imposed an unfortunate standstill on authors. How soon the edition of the text, with translation and commentary, which has been entrusted to these two authoritative students of Gnosis, will see the light, is not yet possible to say.

That my colleague Dr. Quispel, in the midst of his other work on Gnosis, should have found the traces of this MS., followed them up, recognized its origin in the Valentinian circle and laboured with great perseverance over several years to make the MS. accessible to the learned world was a great and permanent service to scholarship. That the Jung Institute at Zurich was able to purchase it was the fruit of his indefatigable exertions. To me it is a privilege so soon after the official announcement of the discovery to have the opportunity of presenting a report on it in this Academy.

As has been made known in the reports in the newspapers, the so-called "Jung Codex" contains four writings, partly in a fragmentary state, together with a few remains of pages which do not appear to belong to a definite work[12]. There have thus come to light: (*a*) an *Apocryphon Jacobi*, a dialogue between Jesus and a few disciples after Christ's resurrection; (*b*) a *Gospel of Truth* (pp. 17-43, of which pp. 33-6 are wanting); (*c*) a *Letter to Rheginos* on the resurrection of the dead; (*d*) a writing of which the beginning, and hence also the title, are wanting but to which its first student gave the name: *Treatise on the Three Natures*. In the present communication I invite your attention—so as not to remain in generalities—to the second item, the *Gospel of Truth*, in its relation to the New Testament.

Irenaeus of Lyons, in his great attack on the heresies, written *c.* 180, tells us that there was a group of Gnostics, viz. the followers of a certain Valentinus, who were bold and evil enough to pretend to possess, in addition to the four (canonical) Gospels, a "Gospel of Truth". According to his account they had put it together in the recent past and it was in radical disagreement with the Gospels of the Apostles[13]. This account is to be found—it is important to observe this point—not in Irenaeus's description of the doctrines of these Gnostics in Book I of his "Refutation", but in passing in Book III. Nothing is quoted from it nor are its contents discussed. In the histories of early Christian literature, it is usually linked with a reference in Pseudo-Tertullian, who in the summary style of his *Adversus Omnes Haereses* says about Valentinus (iv 6) *Evangelium habet etiam suum praeter haec nostra*[14].

These passages have hitherto been the only references to the existence of such a "Gospel of Truth". In such enumerations of the Apocryphal Gospels as that in the *Decretum Gelasianum* and among the many "agrapha" (i.e. words of Jesus not to be found in the Gospels) we seek for it in vain. This information by itself is of little use. Conjectures which had been made hitherto about the character and extent of the *Evangelium Veritatis*[15] can be quietly set aside, since as long as no syllable of the work was known, they were not more than fruitless guesses. It is indeed very questionable if Irenaeus himself had the work in his hands, for had this been the case he would certainly not have missed the opportunity of pillorying the *audacia* of the heretic. Did he know it solely through hearsay? But how in that case could he have known that it had no points of agreement with the Canonical Gospels? We should also note the contrast between Irenaeus, who speaks of its authors (in the plural) as followers of Valentinus, and the Pseudo-Tertullian for whom—if he is concerned with the same treatise—it is the leader of the heresy, Valentinus himself, who is indicated as its author.

Who was this Valentinus and what is known of his life and work[16]? By the Church Fathers he is often named in a single breath with Marcion and regarded as one of the most formidable heretics. According to Clement of Alexandria he already began his teaching under Hadrian (117-38) and was active in the reign of Antonius Pius (d. 161)[17]. This agrees with a statement of Irenaeus to the effect that Valentinus came to Rome under Hyginus, was at his zenith under Pius and remained there until Anicetus[18]. These assertions fix his activity in the capital with tolerable exactitude as between the years 135 and 160. When Justin Martyr, who appeared as a teacher at Rome in the same period, wrote his *Dialogue with Trypho* (*c.* 155-160 A.D.), he was aware that disciples of Valentinus had established themselves there and were active under the

name of Christians, but he himself was clearly concerned to stand apart from them. To clear himself of the accusations which his opponents laid at his feet he turns them over to the Valentinians among others[19]. As regards the life of Valentinus, Tertullian, who was apparently well informed on the matter, tells us that Valentinus had hoped for the episcopate *quia et ingenio poterat et eloquio*, but that another had obtained it *ex martyrii praerogativa*. This must have been Pius (probably in 140). This ill-success resulted in a breach with the "Church of the Authentic Rule of Faith"[20], not the last instance of someone who out of spite came to found a community of his own. In this passage, which attracts attention by its laudable witness to the capacities of Valentinus—its testimony is all the greater in that it is conveyed through the fierce and grim Tertullian—there are two further points which have hitherto attracted little attention: (1) That after his unsuccessful endeavour to become a bishop Valentinus passed over to the opponents of truth and *cuiusdam veteris opinionis semen nactus colubroso viam delineavit*; (2) That Tertullian points to a difference of considerable extent between Valentinus and his great pupil Ptolemy in the matter of the conception of God: *nominibus et numeris aeonum distinctis in personales substantias, sed extra deum determinatas* [Ptolemaeus], *quas Valentinus in ipsa summa divinitatis ut sensus et affectus motus incluserat*[21]. This passage clearly indicates a breach with the Church and a turning to another doctrine whereby Tertullian possibly points in a veiled way to the Ophites (serpent-worshippers), a well-known Gnostic group. But it also makes reference to a development in the doctrine of Valentinus' school which as yet was not more than a divergence in lesser matters, a subject about which Irenaeus sometimes speaks[22]. Whether Valentinus made his way from Rome to Cyprus and there came into conflict with the Church a second time, as Epiphanius (4th cent.) narrates, is uncertain. Such indeed is possible, since at that date there was as yet no general excommunication, and the Bishop of Salamis in Cyprus may have based his account on local tradition; but it is also possible that this passage was written *ad maiorem gloriam ecclesiae Salaminae* which, as a Church always true to orthodox doctrine, put out a claim to have resisted such a chief of heretics as Valentinus.

Only a few fragments of Valentinus' teaching have been preserved[23]. Apart from these we are dependent on the observations of his opponents. This is a curious and regrettable situation, for we would gladly know more about this figure who, as is well known, was an important person. That he was of more than ordinary significance is clear from the fact that he was regarded as one of the arch-heretics and above all from the success which resulted from his activity. Tertullian describes his following as a *frequentissimum collegium*[24]. In East and West alike there arose schools of

his disciples[25]. One of his followers, a certain Marcus, as a result of his peculiar cultic practices, achieved admitted success in Asia Minor and through his pupils, with whom Irenaeus came into contact, in Gaul. Down to the fourth century, communities existed in Egypt and Asia which were named after Valentinus[26].

Into the details of this teaching there is no need to enter in the present connexion. It is first and foremost to the *Gospel of Truth*, which has been brought to light by the Jung Codex, that we must turn our attention here. Is it possible that this writing is identical with the Gospel which was mentioned by Irenaeus and pseudo-Tertullian?

In the *Gospel of Truth* itself, no word is to be found as to its date or provenance, as to the author or his place of residence. From its last page (p. 43 of the Codex) it is clear that we have to do with a single author since we read in the singular: "It beseems me, who have been in the Rest, to say nothing more than this; but I shall be in Him in order to dedicate myself at all times to the Father of the All". Moreover, the style is everywhere the same and nowhere points to a number of authors. Hence if the *Gospel of Truth* is in fact identical with the work referred to by Irenaeus, then the plural *ab his conscriptum* is used incorrectly, and the Bishop of Lyons either possessed no accurate data about its author or else he used the expression in question in a general sense (for "put together in their circle").

We ask then: Is it possible that the recovered *Gospel of Truth* is identical with the *Evangelium Veritatis* of which Irenaeus had heard? In any case the two works have the same name and nowhere else do we hear of groups which possessed such a Gospel. Moreover, it is clear from its terminology that the newly-recovered work arose in Valentinian circles (use of πλήρωμα, ὑστέρημα; a numerical speculation on the Parable of the Lost Sheep, on which I shall have more to say later)[27]. Also the one concrete point that Irenaeus tells us, viz. that it agrees at no point with the Gospels of the Apostles, fully accords with the character of the recently discovered writing. For however many are the points at which the familiar Gospels of the New Testament differ from each other, they all agree in attempting to give historical accounts about Jesus Christ, to describe His life in a definite development which proceeds from His Baptism by John down to His Crucifixion and Resurrection, and in presenting the words and deeds of Jesus in a sometimes very loose sequence but with very concrete data. Of such a plan nothing at all is to be found in the *Gospel of Truth*. Here no narratives are given, the Crucifixion is announced already at the outset (p. 18), while particular facts are not to be found. The work must be described rather as a sermon, a devotional contemplation, or, if one will, a dogmatic or mystical tractate[28], in which we are told how the not-

knowing of the Father of All, whereby error came into being, was abolished by the appearance of Jesus on the scene so that we now know the Father and learn to rest in Him. Here we are given no "Logia Iesou"[29] nor do we find the life and works of Jesus set in their connexion with the Old Testament revelation, as is the case in the New Testament. The Old Testament background is essentially weak, and makes itself felt in only a few places. Moreover, we may already here call attention to the fact that the treatise contains nothing of what has frequently been considered the kernel of Gnostic mythology, viz. the journey of the soul to heaven or of the redeemed Redeemer. Summing up, we can say that the name, origin and plan of the work are in full accord with the account of Irenaeus. After carefully weighing the evidence, I do not find a single reason for doubting the identity of the two.

This gives us an important result, viz. that we have established as its *terminus ad quem* the age of Irenaeus (*c.* 180). Is it possible to reach any greater precision?

On pp. 31-2 the Jung Codex has the following strange account:

> He is the Shepherd who left the ninety and nine sheep which had not gone astray; he sought the one that had gone astray; he rejoiced when he found it. For ninety and nine is a number which is counted on the left hand, which comprehends it, but when the one is found the whole total passes over to the right hand.

For the moment let us put aside the relation of this passage to the parable of Matt. 18:12-14 = Luc. 15:4-6. The assertion is remarkable about 99 on the left hand while when one is added to make 100 the number passes over to the right hand. It is known that this application of the "Parable of the Lost Sheep" was used in the circles of Valentinus' pupils. With regard to the Marcosians, Irenaeus writes, *inter alia, Adv. Haer.* I 16:2: διὸ καὶ φεύγειν αὐτοῦ διὰ τῆς γνώσεως τὴν τῶν ἐνενηκονταεννέα χώραν, τουτέστι τὸ ὑστέρημα, τύπον ἀριστερᾶς χειρός· μεταδιώκειν δὲ τὸ ἓν προστεθὲν τοῖς ἐνενηκονταεννέα εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ χεῖρα μετέστησε[30]. This interpretation presupposes a method of expressing numbers with the right and left hands which was in use among the Romans and is described in detail by the Venerable Bede[31]. According to this, the numbers up to 99 were reproduced by different positions of the fingers of the left hand, while 100 and the following hundreds were expressed with the right hand. According to the account of Dr. E. J. Dijksterhuis it was a method of reckoning known solely in the West. There are no traces of any acquaintance with it in Greece and the East, where other methods of counting were customary. This fact gives us a valuable hint as to the region to which our work belongs. Because this kind of explanation was

intelligible only in the West of the Roman Empire, the *Gospel of Truth* must have had its origin here. Hence Rome, as the place where the first attack on the Gnostics, viz. the lost "Syntagma" of Justin Martyr[32], originated, comes first into consideration.

If we now proceed to compare this *Gospel of Truth* with what is known from other sources about the Valentinians, e.g. from Irenaeus, Tertullian and Hippolytus, we are astonished to find that what the ecclesiastical writers make the principal point of their description and attack is here entirely wanting. There is no account of an elaborate doctrine of aeons, whereby these aeons emanate from the Godhead in a procession of thirty forms; there is not even a single allusion to it; the aeons here play a totally different role. It is also remarkable that the "primal sin" (*Ursünde*) is described not, as in the previously known forms of the doctrine of the Valentinians, as the fall of the aeon Sophia, but as proceeding from a not-knowing, a forgetting of the Father. There is also no mention of a Demiurge in contradistinction from the highest God; the Father was not unknowable, but rather no longer known, forgotten. All this points to a stage in Valentinian doctrine which is prior to its later development in such a teacher as Ptolemaeus, or even in Valentinus himself as his doctrine is described in Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I 11 or Pseudo-Tertullian[33]. Nor is there any hint here of the existence of some kind of exoteric doctrine in contrast to the strict Gnostic teaching, such as we find in Ptolemaeus in his "Letter to Flora"[34]. On the contrary, the opening words (see below, p. 174) refer expressly to the men who have "found". What we have here is genuine Gnostic doctrine. But we miss the distinct and typical points of Valentinianism, although the origin of our treatise in this circle is beyond question. At this point we are helped out by the remark of Tertullian already referred to (see p. 168). For on the very matter of the doctrine of God he notes a difference between Valentinus and Ptolemaeus. For the former, *sensus et affectus motus* are within the Godhead; for the latter, *personales substantiae* are *extra deum*. What we find is that the Nous, Ennoia, Sophia, Charis, etc., of which mention is made in the *Gospel of Truth*, are extant *within* the Godhead and not outside it. We notice further that in the surviving fragments of Valentinus on several occasions there is a characteristic way of speaking about Καρδία[35], while the same characteristic recurs in the *Gospel of Truth* (for instances of this see below, pp. 177 and 178); and that this, too, is a mark of Valentinus in distinction from the other Gnostics. If we see here in the *Gospel of Truth* a certain reserve in its attitude to Docetism, which also finds support in a fragment[36], then all this points in one direction and would lead us to conclude: *The author of the* Gospel of Truth *was Valentinus himself*. The style, with its "Asianisms" and its figurative language,

which betrays formal agreement with the fragments, is in complete accord with what a mode of writing which merited Tertullian's commendation of Valentinus' *eloquentia*, would require.

I am fully conscious that this remains a hypothesis. Yet it is one which is in harmony with the internal data, is supported by the witness of Tertullian and has the testimony of Pseudo-Tertullian (p. 167) in its favour. And as yet I have been unable to discover any arguments against it[37].

It thus appears to me allowable to ascribe the *Gospel of Truth* to Valentinus. The assertion of Irenaeus that the treatise was written not long ago (*non olim conscriptum*) does not conflict with this. The purpose of this statement, which would assign the work to a recent date, was to contrast it with the four Canonical Gospels received by the Church which had come down from the age of the Apostles and were then about a century old. The passage may be read in the light of a saying of Tertullian, *De Praescr.* 30: *non adeo olim fuisse*, which is explained by the words: *Antonini fere principatu*. And with it may be compared such a statement in the *Muratorian Canon* (probably from the end of the second century) as lines 74-7, where it is said about the *Shepherd of Hermas*, which was excluded from public reading by the Church, that the writing was composed *nuperrime temporibus nostris ... sedente cathedra urbis Romae ecclesiae Pio episcopo fratre eius*[38]. All this language points in the same direction. For writers at the end of the second century the time of Antoninus Pius was indeed "not long ago"[39].

Now there remains one remarkable fact, namely that Irenaeus has so little to say against this "Evangelium Veritatis". He observes that it was of recent date compared with the Canonical Gospels: that it was placed by the Valentinians side by side with the orthodox writings; and that it agrees in no points with those of the Apostles. But he does not subject it to any incisive criticism. The question arises: Why not? Did he not have it in his own hands? If not, how did he know that it was *in nihilo conveniens apostolorum evangeliis*? Could it also be that he had indeed seen it, but that in fact he had little to say about it? I ask this question since though the content of the *Gospel of Truth* is Gnostic, its Gnosticism is not emphasized. We have already pointed to the absence from the treatise of the typical elements of Valentinian Gnosis in its classical elaboration (p. 171). If Christ is mentioned as the Logos, the Saviour, the Messenger, these are not terms which could be described as specifically Gnostic, although they are sometimes found among the Gnostics[40]. But they also occur in Valentinus' contemporary and fellow-citizen, his rival as a teacher, Justin Martyr, who was certainly no Gnostic[41]. The description of God as "Father of the All" is also a favourite expression of Justin, who himself uses it in the baptismal formula[42], though he probably did not draw the

same consequences from the term. It is also possible to point to parallels with the conception of God in Aristides[43]. Even the emphasis here on the ἄγνοια of God as the characteristic mark of sin is not as remarkable as it might appear. Justin, too, uses this word to indicate the pre-Christian pagan stage[44], as does also the New Testament, e.g. Acts 17:30: χρόνους τῆς ἀγνοίας[45]. That the context and emphasis are different is a consequence of the divergent aims of the different writings. In this connexion it is important to observe that various words which to our ears sound typically Gnostic had not yet become such by themselves. I can well imagine an orthodox Christian of this period listening to the *Gospel of Truth* and hearing the "sermon" with approval and gratitude; he might have found it somewhat peculiar in conception, but not to be wholly rejected. This suggestion finds support in the assertion of Tertullian that Valentinus went astray only after his unsuccessful attempt to obtain the episcopate, a fact which would lead me to date the writing at the time of Valentinus' breach with the Church, either shortly before or shortly after this event, say round about 140-45. Valentinus appears to have attempted to continue for a time in as close proximity to the Church as possible. Such can be inferred from Tertullian, *De Praescr.* 30:2, where we read of him and Marcion: *in catholicam primo doctrinam credidisse apud ecclesiam Romanensem, sub episcopatu Eleutheri benedicti; donec ob inquietam semper curiositatem, qua fratres quoque vitiabant, semel et iterum eiecti*[46], i.e. that he had once come back again, which would have been possible only if he had not departed too far in his doctrines. However this may be, it appears to me that in the interpretation of this writing we certainly ought not to overlook such contemporary "orthodox" writers as Hermas and above all Justin. For the purposes of comparison the material supplied by these works can be of the greatest usefulness[47].

As the outcome of the preceding considerations I would maintain the following thesis: The *Gospel of Truth*, which has been recovered in the Jung Codex, was written by Valentinus at Rome round about 140-45, before the development of the typically Gnostic dogmas.

What was the author's purpose in writing this *Gospel of Truth*, a work whose plan and line of thought are at times so obscure? We have already noticed that the structure of the treatise is totally different from that of the Gospels familiar to us. The same may be said if we compare the *Gospel of Truth*, whether in form or content, with the Apocryphal Gospels, so far as these have been wholly or partially preserved. We may assert, or conjecture, that these Apocryphal Gospels aim at correcting or supplementing the Canonical Gospels, and that they put heretical ideas into the mouth of Jesus. But in our case it is otherwise. If we go back to its title, we might

suppose that the genitive "Veritatis" (ἀληθείας) is here a *genitivus qualitatis*, i.e. a substitute for the adjective, in which according to Blass-Debrunner[48] a Hebrew linguistic usage is reflected. In that case the name would therefore mean: "The True Gospel", i.e. in distinction from and opposition to the orthodox writings. But there is nothing to indicate, so far as this can be determined through the medium of a Coptic translation of a Greek text, that the author had any knowledge of Semitic language. Moreover—and this is important—there is no trace of polemic or rivalry. Had such been the intention of the author, then to achieve success he must have set about his task in quite another way[49].

The emphasis lies not on the word "Gospel", but on the words "of Truth". Indeed, at the beginning the author says on p. 17: "This name of the Gospel is the revelation of the hope, which they also find who seek it". Truth here stands opposed to the error which has proceeded from the not-knowing of the Father. He could have taken over with approval Justin's words: ἀληθείας παρατεθείσης ἄγνοιαν φυγεῖν (*Apol.* 12:11). Truth, as ἀ-λήθεια, stands opposed to λήθη, "forgetting" (*het vergeten*) (p. 18). But truth is no abstraction; no eulogies are sung on its behalf; we seek in vain for any such play on the sense as in Jn. 8:32: "The truth shall make you free". The word itself occurs comparatively seldom. The writer is concerned not about words and thoughts but about the method in which God has brought the annihilation of this ἄγνοια to pass[50]. This ignorance is not that which conceals an ἄγνωστος θεός, who was not known, but a loss of knowledge by those who are from Him and in Him. We might describe the theme of this book as an elaboration of the thoughts contained in Acts 17:25-30: We live in God and know Him not. How did this ignorance reach its term?

The word "Gospel" must also be here understood in the light of early Christian linguistic usage, when it was not yet limited to a species of book. In the New Testament εὐαγγέλιον occurs very frequently with the meaning of "good tidings", for the whole substance of what Jesus and His disciples proclaimed as salvation. This same wide meaning of the word is still found in the first half of the second century. The misunderstanding of Irenaeus arose from the fact that he already possessed another sense of the word "Gospel" when it was used in connexion with a writing[51]. The opening words: "Gospel of Truth, joy for those who have received grace through the Father of Truth, that they know Him" have no reference to the title of a book, but express a cry of jubilation by one who has heard a joyous message. Hence our treatise is a sermon or meditation rather than a writing which belongs to the same category as our familiar Gospels.

This being its character, it follows that any comparison of it with the New Testament must proceed differently from what one would expect on first hearing its title. It is impossible to set to work in the same way as in comparing the Apocryphal with the Canonical Gospels. Yet it is evident that we must inquire into the relation of this writing, which, as its beginning clearly indicates, professes to be Christian, to the New Testament. Indeed, to consider the relation of Gnosis as embodied in one of its outstanding representatives to the classical documents of Christianity is a matter of fundamental importance.

This task is made the more difficult by the fact that the *Gospel of Truth* never makes literal citations in the same way as do e.g. the so-called Apostolic Fathers. Phrases such as: "the Lord says ..." or "as the Apostle teaches ..." are completely wanting. Also the treatise is wholly without historical references. None the less, as we shall see later, the author made use of the Books of the New Testament, but in a way suited to his own "eloquence", i.e. by working over them and introducing "echoes" of their content. In the cultured world of those days a good style required the employment of reminiscences of well-known authors in their arguments, without express quotation. The practised ear of the educated hearer would recognize these as a matter of course[52].

Before we pass to a discussion of the passages which we are here to consider we must note a point of method. Obviously we must exclude from consideration expressions showing agreement with New Testament texts in passages where certain scholars have held that they could establish an influence of Gnosis on the New Testament itself. When on p. 18 we find a mention of "perfections" or on p. 27 of a "complete man" we are reminded by these words of 1 Cor. 2:6 and Eph. 4:13; but they cannot contribute to a final answer to our question since, according to such scholars as Reitzenstein, St. Paul himself is here dependent on Gnosis. Similarly we must rule out from consideration such words as "pleroma", "rest", the contrast of darkness and light, and the comparison of ignorance with drunkenness and sleep (see below, p. 185). The real question is: Are the reminiscences all of this general kind or is there any clear indication that the author used books which are now comprised within the New Testament?

An excellent starting point for the study of this question is a long passage on pp. 19 f. It runs as follows:

> In the heart [viz. of those who have received the knowledge of God] is revealed the living Book of the Living, which was written in the thought and mind of the Father before the foundation of the world and which was found in the Incomprehensible in Him, the Book, which no man can take, because it was destined for Him Who will take it and Who is slain. None of those

> who have entrusted themselves to redemption can be revealed as long as this Book has not come into their midst. For this reason the merciful, the faithful Jesus was patient, bearing the suffering until He had taken this Book. Because He knows that His death is the life of many—just as the property of a deceased householder is hidden as long as his testament has not been opened, in the same way the All was hidden as long as the Father of the All, Who is One and from Whom all things proceed, remained invisible—for this reason Jesus appeared and revealed this Book. He was nailed to the tree; He affixed this decree of the Father to the cross.

The author is clearly building on the Passion Narrative of the Gospels and the Crucifixion of Jesus. Further it is evident that use is made here of the well-known vision of the throne in Rev. 5. There is the Book (ver. 1), "which no one can take" (ver. 3); the Lamb that was slain (ver. 6), that takes the Book (ver. 8). But it is also clear that the conceptions are transposed after a peculiar way. (The converse view, that the *Gospel of Truth* independently knew a separate document containing the description in Rev. 5 is ruled out by the whole treatment of the material; for what stands in Rev. 5 in an orderly sequence is here conflated with other New Testament material into a truly obscure whole). How this transformation came about becomes clear when we observe that while Rev. here and in other places[53] speaks of a Lamb which *was* slain (perf. part.), the *Gospel of Truth* has the phrase in the conjunctive with future meaning. Here the vision of the throne is depicted in an eschatological setting and the context is metaphysical and a-historical. This is so because the author identified the Book of Rev. 5 with "the Book of Life written from the foundation of the world", cf. Rev. 13:8 (17:8): οὐ γέγραπται τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐν τῷ βιβλίῳ τῆς ζωῆς τοῦ ἀρνίου τοῦ ἐσφαγμένου ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κοσμοῦ[54]. The Book which is closed is at the same time compared with a testament. Now in this passage Jesus is named "merciful and faithful". This last epithet πιστός is also found several times in the last Book of the New Testament[55], but the combination never. As far as I can ascertain this combination is unique in early Patristic literature. It occurs in only one place, viz. Heb. 2:17 ἵνα ἐλεήμων γένηται καὶ πιστὸς ἀρχιερεὺς τὰ πρὸς τὸν θεόν, that is, of the High Priest Who acc. to Heb. gives Himself up to sacrifice and of Whom in 5:2 it is said that He was able to have compassion on the ignorant and erring (μετριοπαθεῖν δυνάμενος τοῖς ἀγνοοῦσιν καὶ πλανωμένοις), which is precisely a sequence of thought which accords with our treatise. The thought that only by means of death does a διαθήκη come into effect could also have been borrowed from Heb. 9:16 f.[56] Further there is a clear reference to the Crucifixion of Jesus in the words: "He was nailed to a tree" (on p. 18 the same expression; this thus appears to have been part of the regular terminology and not to have been suggested by Col. 2:14 about which we speak later). That verb does

not occur in the New Testament in connexion with the Crucifixion (but cf. Acts 2:23 προσπήξαντες and Acts 5:30 (10:39) κρεμάσαντες ἐπὶ ξύλου). But in Jn. 20:25 there is reference to τὸν τύπον τῶν ἥλων and τὸν τόπον τῶν ἥλων in the resurrected Christ, which presupposes that Jesus was firmly nailed to the cross. In the *Gospel of Peter* VI 21 it is said that after the death of Jesus the nails were drawn out from His hands[57]. Justin Martyr asserts that at the Crucifixion Ps. 22:17 received its fulfilment: ὅτε γὰρ ἐσταύρωσαν αὐτόν, ἐμπήσσοντες τοὺς ἥλους τὰς χεῖρας καὶ τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ ὤρυξαν[58]. In Valentinus' disciple Marcus we find the matter expressed precisely. In a discussion of the great importance of the number "six" there is mention *inter alia* of "the sixth hour" ἐν ᾗ προσηλώθη τῷ ξύλῳ[59]. Hence this usage was familiar to the Valentinians, though the possibility that Marcus knew the *Gospel of Truth* cannot be ruled out. But it was not confined to Valentinus, since Melito of Sardis in his *Discourse on the Passion* also twice uses the word for the Crucifixion[60]. Hence this designation for the Crucifixion is in itself not remarkable. But it is indeed curious that the writer should have united a typical favourite figure of style[61] with an expression of St. Paul, where the same verb occurs in the active, viz. the mention in Col. 2:14 of a χειρόγραφον, which Jesus had προσηλώσας ... τῷ σταυρῷ.

We must now draw attention to three points: (1) Jesus knows that His death is the life of many. This saying is also not found literally either in the New Testament or in early Christian literature, however well it may epitomize one of the leading thoughts of the New Testament. In this connexion we naturally think of such a saying as Mk. 14:24 τὸ αἷμά μου τῆς διαθήκης τὸ ἐκχυννόμενον ὑπὲρ πολλῶν, where the notion of the διαθήκη is present as a connecting link[62]. (2) God is here named: "The Father of the All, One from Whom all proceeds"; this reminds us of such passages as Eph. 4:6 εἷς θεὸς καὶ πατὴρ πάντων, ὁ ἐπὶ πάντων καὶ διὰ πάντων καὶ ἐν πᾶσιν and 1 Cor. 8:6 εἷς θεὸς ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα[63]. (3) This Book, which as appears from the whole context is the new διαθήκη of Christ, is revealed "in their hearts". This tendency to introspection which, as we have observed, is so characteristic of Valentinus, with the word καρδία points to 2 Cor. 3:1-3; for this is a characteristic trait of the "new covenant", cf. Jer. 31:33 "I will write my law in their hearts" = Heb. 8:10[64].

A second example which throws light on the methods of our Gnostic author is the passage already cited (p. 170) about the search for the Lost Sheep. This is clearly an elaboration of Matt. 18:12-14-Lk. 15:4-6. I am inclined to prefer the Matthean text on account both of the setting of the parable and on grounds of vocabulary[65]; "gone astray" = twice in Matt. 18:12; ver. 12 "he sought that which had gone astray" = ζητεῖ τὸ πλανώμενον; "who left" = ἀφήσει cf. the variant ἀφείς in ℵ ℭ pm. As

regards the application of the parable we must consider that not only does the *Gospel of Truth* make use of the Roman method of reckoning already discussed, but that it is also a matter of importance for the author that the left hand is the unfavourable quarter while the right is propitious[66]. For our author the significance of the parable lies pre-eminently in the numbers: in 99 one unit is wanting (ὑστέρημα), whereby it is unfavourable, but if that "one" = "knowledge of God", the One (emphasis is laid on this point at every turn[67]), is added, then it passes over to the good side. The interpretation is thus completely different from that in the Canonical Gospels. But this is no indication that the *Gospel of Truth* used a version different from that of Matthew.

A third clear reference to the New Testament follows at once. "This Man himself laboured on the Sabbath for the sheep when it was discovered that it had fallen into a pit. He gave life to the sheep which He brought aloft from the pit, so that you may know in your hearts what the Sabbath is, whereon it is not permitted that redemption should rest". Here we find a clear combination of Matt. 12:11 f., from a discourse of Jesus about a healing on the Sabbath: τίς ἔσται ἐξ ὑμῶν ἄνθρωπος ὃς ἕξει πρόβατον ἕν, καὶ ἐὰν ἐμπέσῃ τοῦτο τοῖς σάββασιν εἰς βόθυνον, οὐχὶ κρατήσει αὐτὸ καὶ ἐγερεῖ, with the healing on the Sabbath at the προβατική in Jn. 5:1 ff., where Jesus in ver. 17 says: ὁ πατήρ μου ἕως ἄρτι ἐργάζεται· κἀγὼ ἐργάζομαι. In this we may also notice that a reminiscence of Jn. 10:28 δίδωμι αὐτοῖς ζωὴν αἰώνιον is to be found here; cf. also 10:10 ἐγὼ ἦλθον ἵνα ζωὴν ἔχωσιν. Moreover, we again have here language about "laws in the heart"; see above page 177. We may conjecture that behind the question about the Sabbath healing lay the present significance of the Fourth Commandment, for this was an acute matter in the second century when the break had been made with the Jewish conception of the Law[68].

We may point to yet another remarkable passage. On p. 42 we read: "(The men) in whom God will find His root and will suffer no damage to His purpose". This last statement recalls Matt. 16:26 par.: "What shall it avail a man if he shall win the whole world, but lose his soul" (τὴν δὲ ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ ζημιωθῇ). In the Coptic version of the New Testament we find the same expression word for word as in the *Gospel of Truth*. But while in Matt. it is said of a man and is clear ("to be lost for ever"), in the Gnostic work it is said of God! In the Biblical conception of God this is impossible, but for the God of the Gnostic Who comprises the All, it is not so strange: where a part of the All-God perishes, God Who is identical with the All suffers damage.

Those who have read Carola Barth's book on *Die Interpretation des Neuen Testaments in der valentinianischen Gnosis*[69] will not be surprised at this method of treating the New Testament, with its combination of texts,

governed by the use of a series of catchwords—so strange for our ideas—and these peculiar allegories.

It is true that this style was not unknown at that time to Jews, Greeks and Christians. Applied otherwise it is to be met with, indeed, among the "orthodox" contemporaries of Valentinus. From the examples given here it is clear that the writer made use of the Gospels of Matt. and John, of 1 Cor., Col., Heb. and Rev.

Anyone who has ever looked out on this wide vista and learnt the method of work from these examples, is able to go further. These examples sharpen the ear to perceive ever more "echoes" ("*Anklänge*"); we know what we can expect. The appended list, which follows the text of the *Gospel of Truth*, is not complete. In the forthcoming edition with commentary an attempt will be made to present the complete material. We note here the following passages:

p. 17, 7: "the finding of those who seek"	cf. Matt. 7:7 ζητεῖτε καὶ εὑρήσετε.
p. 18, 8: "because they knew not the Father"	Jn. 16:3 ὅτι οὐκ ἔγνωσαν τὸν πατέρα.
p. 18, 15: "the hidden mystery"	Eph. 3:9 τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ ἀποκεκρυμμένου. Col. 1:26 τὸ μυστήριον τὸ ἀποκεκρυμμένον.
p. 18, 14: "through the mercy of the Father"	Lk. 1:78 διὰ σπλάγχνα ἐλέους θεοῦ. I Pet. 1:3 κατὰ τὸ πολὺ αὐτοῦ ἔλεος.
p. 18, 16: "Jesus Christ has illuminated"	1 Cor. 4:5 ὁ κύριος, ὃς καὶ φωτίσει τὰ κρυπτὰ τοῦ σκότους. Jn. 1:9 φωτίζει πάντα ἄνθρωπον.
p. 18, 19: "This way is the truth which He has taught them"	Mk. 12:14 ἐπ' ἀληθείας τὴν ὁδὸν τοῦ θεοῦ διδάσκεις. ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας: Jas. 5:19 var. lect. and 2 Pet. 2:2; cf. Kittel, loc. cit., vol. V, s.v.
"they nailed Him to a tree: He has become a fruit of the knowledge of the Father"	cf. on this above, p. 176 f.; here the Cross is named ξύλον—Acts 5:30, 10:39 (part of the primitive Kerygma!); behind this lies the conception of the Cross as the tree of life, see the application of Ps. 1:3 in *Barnabas* 11:6 (cf. Windisch ad. loc.) to the Cross of Christ and cf. L. von Sybel, 'Ξύλον ζωῆς', in: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* xix (1919-20), pp. 85-91.

p. 18, 13: "The All was in Him"

Col. 1:17 καὶ τὰ πάντα ἐν αὐτῷ συνέστηκεν (where this is said of Christ and not of the Father as in *Gospel of Truth*).

p. 19, 13: "Wishes that they knew Him ... what need was there then of knowledge with regard to the Father"

Heb. 8:11 quoting Jer. 31:34 ὅτι πάντες εἰδήσουσίν με. 1 Tim. 2:4 ὃς πάντας ἀνθρώπους θέλει σωθῆναι καὶ εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἀληθείας ἐλθεῖν.

p. 19, 20: "He spoke the word as a teacher"

Jesus as διδάσκαλος is very frequent in the Gospels—see concordance.

p. 19, 21: "To Him came those wise in their own heart, who tempted Him; but He perceived them, that they were vain; they hated Him because they were not truly wise. After all these the little ones came to Him, those in whom the knowledge of the Father is...."

"tempting", often in the Gospels introducing controversies between Jesus and the Rabbis—see concordance; on the wise who are put to shame, cf. Rom. 1:21 f. ἐματαιώθησαν ... φάσκοντες εἶναι σοφοὶ ἐμωράνθησαν. 1 Cor. 1:27 ἵνα καταισχύνῃ τοὺς σοφούς (the whole passage from 1 Cor. 1 should be compared); "hated" Jn. 7:7 ἐμὲ δὲ μισεῖ, cf. 15:18.—On the contrast see Matt. 11:25—Lk. 10:21 ὅτι ἔκρυψας ταῦτα ἀπὸ σοφῶν καὶ συνετῶν καὶ ἀπεκάλυψας αὐτὰ νηπίοις (the foll. verses are also very suitable for Gnostic use: 'knowing the Father'; "rest"). The "little ones" are a special subject of Jesus' care, Matt. 18:6, 10 and 14, and parr.—see also in this connexion p. 177 note 65.

p. 20, 30: "He has taken off these mortal old clothes: He has put on immortality"

1 Cor. 15:53 δεῖ γὰρ τὸ φθαρτὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ τὸ θνητὸν τοῦτο ἐνδύσασθαι ἀθανασίαν. 2 Cor. 5:4 οὐ θέλομεν ἐκδύσασθαι, ἀλλ' ἐπενδύσασθαι, ἵνα καταποθῇ τὸ θνητὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς—see also Col. 2:15 ἀπεκδυσάμενος (directly following the quotation from Col. 2:14; see p. 177).

p. 21, 4: "which are written in the Book of the Living"

cf. p. 175 f., Phil. 4:3 ὧν τὰ ὀνόματα ἐν βίβλῳ ζωῆς—but Ps. 68 (69):29 ἐκ βιβλίου ζώντων.

p. 21, 25: "Those whose names He has known from the beginning have been called towards the end"

Is. 43:1 ἐκάλεσά σε τὸ ὄνομά σου—45:3 ἐγὼ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὁ καλῶν τὸ ὄνομά σου—Jn. 10:3 τὰ ἴδια πρόβατα καλεῖ κατ' ὄνομα (ℵCΘ pm.—Nestle reads

	φωνεῖ).—Rom. 8:30 οὓς δὲ προέγνω (so Cod. A; Nestle reads with the majority of MSS., προώρισεν, as in ver. 29), τούτους καὶ ἐκάλεσεν.— 2 Thess. 2:14 ὅτι εἵλατο ὑμᾶς ὁ θεὸς ἀπ' ἀρχῆς (so with ℵΨ𝔍D. pm. it sy^{p}.) εἰς σωτηρίαν ἐν ἁγιασμῷ πνεύματος καὶ πίστει ἀληθείας, εἰς ὃ καὶ ἐκάλεσεν.
p. 22, 9: "He performs the will of Him Who called them"	Jn. 7:17 ἐάν τις θέλῃ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ποιεῖν—Rom. 9:11 ἐκ τοῦ καλοῦντος—1 Thess. 5:24 πιστὸς ὁ καλῶν; on God's καλεῖν see Kittel, op. cit., III, pp. 489 f.
p. 22, 11: "He will do what is pleasing to Him"	2 Cor. 5:9 φιλοτιμούμεθα ... εὐάρεστοι αὐτῷ εἶναι.
p. 22, 12: "The name of someone becomes his name"	Rev. 2:17, 3:12 ὄνομα καινόν.
p. 22, 18: "He returns to himself"	Lk. 15:17 εἰς ἑαυτὸν ἐλθών.
p. 22, 20: "He has turned many away from error"	Acts 3:26 εὐλογοῦντα ὑμᾶς ἐν τῷ ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον ἀπὸ τῶν πονηριῶν ὑμῶν.
p. 22, 21: "He goes out before them"	Jn. 10:4 ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν πορεύεται.
p. 24, 6: "He purifies them" (see also p. 25: "He will purify them")	1 Jn. 1:9 καθαρίσῃ ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ πάσης ἀδικίας.
p. 24, 21: "He has ... brought the form (σχῆμα) to nought (His form is the cosmos, wherein He served)"	Phil. 2:7 σχήματι εὑρεθεὶς ὡς ἄνθρωπος ἐταπείνωσεν ἑαυτὸν γενόμενος ὑπήκοος μέχρι θανάτου, θανάτου δὲ σταυροῦ—1 Cor. 7:31 παράγει γὰρ τὸ σχῆμα τοῦ κόσμου τούτου—Mk. 10:45, the Son of Man came διακονῆσαι, cf. p. 177, n. 62.
p. 25, 17: "As death is swallowed up by life"	2 Cor. 5:4 ἵνα καταποθῇ τὸ θνητὸν ὑπὸ τῆς ζωῆς.
p. 26, 2: The judgement, "which is as a drawn two-edged sword" which cuts in all directions	Heb. 4:12 the λόγος τοῦ θεοῦ ... τομώτερος ὑπὲρ πᾶσαν μάχαιραν δίστομον καὶ διικνούμενος ... καὶ κριτικὸς ἐνθυμήσεων καὶ ἐννοιῶν καρδίας—cf. also Rev. 2:12, 2:16.
p. 26, 7: The Word, "which had received not only a sound, but also a body"	Jn. 1:14 ὁ λόγος σὰρξ ἐγένετο.

p. 27, 8: "He hath revealed Him"	Jn. 1:18 ἐκεῖνος ἐξηγήσατο.
p. 27, 12: "They that had come forth from Him"	Rom. 11:36 ἐξ αὐτοῦ ... τὰ πάντα.
p. 27, 23: "The Father is perfect and knows all things"	Matt. 5:48 ὁ πατήρ ... τέλειός ἐστιν—1 Jn. 3:20 καὶ γινώσκει πάντα.
p. 30, 14: "Blessed is He Who opened the eyes of the blind"	Jn. 11:37 οὗτος ὁ ἀνοίξας τοὺς ὀφθαλμοὺς τοῦ τυφλοῦ (cf. Jn. 9, 10:21 and other healings of the Blind in the Gospels, e.g. Matt. 9:27 f., 11:5, etc.).
p. 30, 26: (After the Resurrection of Christ, He) "gave them the possibility of knowing"	Phil. 3:10 τοῦ γνῶναι αὐτὸν καὶ τὴν δύναμιν τῆς ἀναστάσεως αὐτοῦ.
p. 30, 27: "For when they saw and heard Him, He granted them to taste and to smell and to touch Him, the Beloved Son"	Cf. the post-Resurrection narratives in the Gospels, e.g. Lk. 24:36 ff. (ψηλαφήσατέ με), Jn. 20:19-20; 1 Pet. 2:3 εἰ ἐγεύσασθε ὅτι χρηστὸς ὁ κύριος—1 Jn. 1:1 ὃ ἀκηκόαμεν, ὃ ἑωράκαμεν τοῖς ὀφθαλμοῖς ἡμῶν, ὃ ἐθεασάμεθα καὶ αἱ χεῖρες ἡμῶν ἐψηλάφησαν.—"The Beloved Son": Matt. 3:17 ὁ υἱός μου ὁ ἀγαπητός—17:5 and parr.—2 Pet. 1:17.
p. 30, 34: "He breathed into them"	Jn. 20:22 ἐνεφύσησεν [+ αὐτοῖς D sy].
p. 30, 35: "While He did His Will"	Jn. 4:34 ἐμὸν βρῶμά ἐστιν ἵνα ποιῶ τὸ θέλημα τοῦ πέμψαντός με.
p. 31, 4: "He came in the flesh, without anything hindering His path"	Lk. 24:39 καὶ ἴδετε, ὅτι πνεῦμα σάρκα καὶ ὀστέα οὐκ ἔχει καθὼς ἐμὲ θεωρεῖτε ἔχοντα—Jn. 20:26 ἔρχεται ὁ Ἰησοῦς τῶν θυρῶν κεκλεισμένων (cf. ver. 19)—1 Jn. 4:3 I.X. ἐν σαρκὶ ἐληλυθότα.
p. 32, 26: "Say then in your hearts that you see this perfect day and that the light dwelleth in you"	1 Thess. 5:5 πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς υἱοὶ φωτός ἐστε καὶ υἱοὶ ἡμέρας.
p. 37, 21: "Nothing happens apart from Him nor does anything happen apart from the Will of the Father"	Matt. 10:29, where the ordinary text reads ἄνευ τοῦ πατρός, but from Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* II 26:2 (*Sine Patris vestri voluntate*) and quotations in Tertullian and Cyprian and various Old Lat. MSS., it appears that in the 2nd

	cent. the reading: "without *the will* of the Father" was known (see C. Tischendorf, *Novum Testamentum Graece*[8], Leipzig 1869, vol. I, p. 52)—Jn. 1:3 χωρὶς αὐτοῦ ἐγένετο οὐδὲ ἓν ὃ γέγονεν.
p. 38, 10: "He raised Him as Son; He gave Him the Name which He had"	Lk. 3:22 υἱός μου εἶ σύ, ἐγὼ σήμερον γεγέννηκά σε—this is the reading of the text found in D it and in Justin Martyr, cf. also Tischendorf, l.c. I, p. 448 and note 12; the quotation from Ps. 2:7 also in Heb. 1:5, 5:5, Acts 13:33—Jn. 17:12 ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί σου, ᾧ δέδωκάς μοι—Phil. 2:9 ἐχαρίσατο αὐτῷ τὸ ὄνομα.
p. 38, 36: "The Name of the Father is on their heads"	Rev. 14:1 ἔχουσαι τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ καὶ τὸ ὄνομα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ γεγραμμένον ἐπὶ τῶν μετώπων αὐτῶν, see also 22:4.
p. 42, 3: "And they missed not the glory of the Father"	Rom. 3:23 καὶ ὑστεροῦται τῆς δόξης τοῦ θεοῦ.
p. 42, 8: "Knowing everything before it came to pass"	1 Jn. 3:20 (see above, p. 182) and Jn. 14:29 πρὶν γενέσθαι.
p. 42, 17: "And they went not down into hell"	Lk. 10:15 ἕως τοῦ ᾅδου καταβήσῃ = Matt. 11:23.
p. 43: "Over whom the love of the Father is poured out"	Rom. 5:5 ὅτι ἡ ἀγάπη τοῦ θεοῦ ἐκκέχυται ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις ἡμῶν.

Herewith we conclude our survey. It is clear that the writer of the *Gospel of Truth* was acquainted with the Gospels, the Pauline Epistles, Hebrews and Revelation, while there are traces of Acts, 1 John and 1 Peter. That there are not more parallels and that they are not of a different kind is bound up with his chosen purpose and method of work. Taken as a whole the harvest is not small. The author, who in our opinion must be Valentinus, knew these Books and interpreted them in his own way. His language is permeated by them, even in the new Gnostic setting; for him they are the language of the Church. It appears that he used practically the same Books as constitute our present New Testament Canon, though in this connexion we must naturally bear in mind the limitations which his method of work imposes on our present task. The manner in which he treats these documents proves that they had authority for him. They conveyed the Good Tidings which he seeks to reproduce in a short summary way in his *Gospel of Truth*.

This conclusion is important for many reasons. In the first place it is in exact agreement with the evidence of Tertullian. Tertullian[70] points to a contrast between Marcion and Valentinus in their treatment of Scripture. Marcion struck out a great variety of items, but *Valentinus integro instrumento*[71] *uti videtur ... Valentinus autem pepercit, quoniam non ad materiam scripturas, sed materiam ad scripturas excogitavit: et tamen plus abstulit et plus adiecit*[72]*, auferens proprietates singulorum quoque verborum et adiciens dispositiones non comparentium rerum*[73]. It is, of course, true that this verdict would apply to others who wear the badge of strict orthodoxy, but this must not shut our eyes to the fact that Tertullian here perceived the truth in the matter. The New Testaments of Valentinus and Tertullian were absolutely identical. Our study of the *Gospel of Truth* completely confirms his words. Especially since the great work of De Faye on the Gnostics[74], it has been customary to be extremely sceptical of what the Church Fathers tell us of their opponents. We will not attempt to generalize on this subject, but only observe that the reports of Tertullian about Valentinus are in striking agreement with the facts which we find in the *Gospel of Truth*. In future investigations it will be well to give heed to this.

In the second place it is of importance to notice that both Heb. and Rev. are here cited. Valentinus' use of these Books was not recognized in the earlier investigations of Heinrici and Carola Barth[75]. In itself this was not surprising in view of the fragmentary state of the tradition, but a fresh piece of information on the point is important. They are two Books whose place in the Canon for long was controverted and uncertain. In the history of the development of the Canon it is well known that both were rejected in different parts of the Church[76]. But at Rome Heb. was used by 1 Clement and probably also by Justin Martyr, while the latter was in any case familiar with Rev.[77] Justin's testimony thus finds important support in the *Gospel of Truth*. Round about 140-50 a collection of writings was known at Rome and accepted as authoritative which was virtually identical with our New Testament.

In the third place it may be observed that this datum is of importance for the history of the formation of the Canon. It is misleading, as is done, e.g. in the recent second edition of McNeile's *Introduction*[78], to bring the "heretics" together in an appendix. Whether the *Gospel of Truth* was written within or outside the limits of the "Great Church" is irrelevant here, since Valentinus *cum suis* wanted to count as Christians. It must be observed that since the investigations of Zahn and von Harnack the history of the formation of the Canon has practically been at a standstill. It may be hoped that the renaissance of the study of primitive Church history which we are now experiencing will also contribute to this group of problems. For though we may picture the matter as proceeding "in a

straight line", it did not in fact develop in this way. Whatever be our verdict on the conflict in the second and third centuries with regard to the authenticity of various Books, we cannot get away from the certain fact that *c.* 150 this "Canon"—even if the later use of this word was not yet known—was in use, as far as its main items are concerned, at Rome. The way that led to the formation of the Canon was, however, a zig-zag road; and the controversy already mentioned about particular Books appears in a different light. If these observations look forward to what was still future in Church history, another observation can be made about the past, namely that before the Books could be used in the way in which they are used in the *Gospel of Truth*, they must have already enjoyed authority for a considerable time. To treat them as a collection was not a discovery of a few months before. Moreover, we should notice that this all took place before the condemnation of Marcion.

In the fourth place, in consequence of the extensive influences exercised here by the terminology of the New Testament, we may put the question whether various expressions which we purposely eliminated at an earlier point (p. 175), are not really themes of New Testament origin, which have been incorporated into a Gnostic system where they have obtained another and stronger accent than in the New Testament and, perhaps under influence from outside, enjoyed a life of their own. As far as the *Gospel of Truth* is concerned it is in my opinion not certain that we should here accept pre-New Testament influences. Be that as it may, in any case it is of great methodological importance to be able here to see a Gnostic at work and to observe the formation of his "jargon". As the investigation of the subject proceeds we shall need to take account of this and, as has been said[79], we must not overlook matters of chronology.

In a discussion of the relation between the *Gospel of Truth* and the New Testament, the reader might perhaps expect an answer to the question whether the recovered work throws any direct light on the New Testament. From the instances of exegesis listed above, the answer would seem to be in the negative. The *Gospel of Truth* is of the greatest importance for the historical development of Gnosticism, for what it tells us about the doctrines at which the attacks of the ecclesiastical writers were aimed, and for the history of the *Canon* and *Interpretation* of the New Testament, but not for the thought-world of the New Testament writers itself.

It is clear that the *Gospel of Truth* seeks to build on the foundation of the New Testament, but with a plan of its own which was not that outlined in the New Testament. It would need a separate treatise on the theology of the *Gospel of Truth* to expound this plan. I must be allowed to content myself with indicating in a very few words wherein the difference consists. It lies not so much in the particular character of this "knowledge"

(Gnosis) or in the Christology, where it is easy to see points of contact. In my opinion the difference comes out most clearly in the teaching about evil. I purposely do not say in its "Hamartiology", since the word "sin" is not here mentioned. This is symptomatic. Evil and undoing are ἄγνοια and πλάνη. Now it is possible to discover this conception in other early Christian writers, but the difference is that there they do not, as here, constitute the essential realities whereby the relation to God is upset. In the New Testament they are rather forms in which sin appears than wickedness itself. In the Bible the fundamental cleavage rests not on a loss of knowledge about the origin and destiny of man in relation to God, but on disobedience to God's command. This again is bound up with a conception of God which is fundamentally and essentially different. In the *Gospel of Truth* God is the All-Inclusive, from and in Whom everything is, of Whom man is a part[80]; God and all are here thought of as a single entity. It would be possible, indeed, to quote *apart from their context* texts from the New Testament which assert this. But in point of fact it is the closed Stoic conception of God which lies at the bottom of this teaching, whereof use was made somewhat too readily in the Christian theology of those days (e.g. by Aristides and Justin Martyr) in order to provide a generally accepted starting point, even though in the case of the Church Apologists this conception of God was not so "closed" as in the *Gospel of Truth*. It would also be possible to point to other such elements, but the Stoic position is the most outstanding. It brings with it the consequence that history here is really eliminated; it is a timeless occurrence whereby all parts of God come to consciousness and God "suffers no damage in His soul" whereby ὑστέρημα is abolished and everything becomes the πλήρωμα. Within this framework a place was found, even a decisive place, for the history of Jesus. But in contrast with the New Testament and the Apologists, it is noteworthy that there is nothing about a Second Coming. Another striking contrast to the New Testament is the absence of the ethical element, the relation to one's neighbour, the commandment about life in the world. It can also be observed that the "Israelite" basis which underlies the New Testament is wanting and that hence the lines run quite differently. The "fear of the Lord", as a component part of the "knowledge of God", is not to be found in the *Gospel of Truth*. Behind the mask of New Testament expressions, another ὑπόνοια shelters.

Our writing, then, gives us an indication of how an influential teacher preached at Rome in the middle of the second century side by side with such men as Hermas and Justin Martyr. It illustrates the way in which, in the ferment of that age—so important because of its far-reaching consequences, so obscure to us through lack of sources—the Christian faith

was sometimes understood. The working out of these rough outlines must be reserved for a later study in the field of the history of dogma, as must also, e.g., a discussion of the conceptions which were here developed about the "Name" revealed through Christ.

The closer interpretation and elucidation of this writing, which has been brought to light by Dr. Quispel's successful labours, will demand much further work from students of the history of dogma and of liturgy in the Imperial Age. And this is in even another respect an ἀπαρχή. The possibility of a *Corpus Gnosticorum*, side by side with the great editions of the Church Fathers issued at Berlin and Vienna, if the necessary collaboration especially from the Egyptian side is granted, now lies in the near range of possibilities. I hope that this first, and in many respects necessarily provisional, treatment of a limited field will have conveyed an impression of the importance of the discovery at Nag Hammadi.

NOTES

* Appeared in: H. C. Puech-G. Quispel-W. C. van Unnik, *The Jung Codex. A Newly Discovered Gnostic Papyrus*, London 1955, p. 81-129.

[1] The latest survey of the field known to me is that of W. Baumgartner, 'Wiederum die palästinischen Handschriftenfunde', in: *Theologische Zeitschrift* ix (1953), pp. 469-73.

[2] Cf. Togo Mina, 'Le Papyrus Gnostique du Musée Copte', in: *Vigiliae Christianae* II (1948), pp. 129-36; J. Doresse, 'Trois Livres Gnostiques inédits', in: *Vigiliae Christianae* II (1948), pp. 137-60; J. Doresse-T. Mina, 'Nouveaux Textes Gnostiques Coptes decouverts en Haute-Egypte: La Bibliothèque de Chénoboskion' in: *Vigiliae Christianae* III (1949), pp. 129-141.

[3] H. C. Puech, 'Les nouveaux Écrits Gnostiques découverts en Haute-Égypte' in: *Coptic Studies in Honor of Walter Ewing Crum*, Boston 1950, pp. 91-154.

[4] This is made clear in the publication of C. Schmidt (who discovered the treatise), 'Irenaeus und seine Quelle in *Adversus Haereses* I 29', in: *Philothesia Paul Kleinert zum LXX. Geburtstage dargebracht*, Berlin 1907, pp. 317-36. Walter Till is preparing an edition of the *Apocryphon Johannis*. Some copies of it are also extant among the MSS. from Nag Hammadi.

[5] Porphyry, *Vita Plotini* 16; cf. Puech, op. cit., p. 106 f.

[6] G. Quispel, *Gnosis als Weltreligion*, Zürich 1952.

[7] J. de Zwaan, 'Montanus, I Clemens, Ignatius, Tertullianus', in: *Nieuwe Theologische Studiën* xiii (1930), p. 135.

[8] G. Kretschmar, 'Zur religionsgeschichtlichen Einordnung der Gnosis', in: *Evangelische Theologie* xiii (1953), p. 357.Kretschmar here rightly observes "The knots of historical questions cannot be cut by systematic investigation alone. Nothing can contribute to progress except an exact analysis of the history and sources of the individual Gnostic groups" (by "systematic" the author here means: "setting out from a general conception of Gnosis"). Kretschmar, p. 360, rightly draws attention also to the connexion with syncretistic Judaism which is much too readily overlooked.

[9] i.e. "The likeness is more superficial than real".

[10] Cf. on this e.g. W. Grossouw, "The Dead Sea Scrolls and the New Testament, a Preliminary Survey' in: *Studia Catholica* xxvi (1951), pp. 289-99 and xxvii (1952), pp. 1-8; C. H. Hunzinger, 'Neues Licht auf Lc. 2:14' in: *Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* xliv (1952-3), pp. 85-90.

[11] H. C. Puech-G. Quispel, 'Funde und Forschungen zur Gnosis', in: *Neue Zürcher Zeitung*, 15 Nov., 1953. *Inter alia*, Quispel here describes the history of the Codex and its acquisition by the Jung Institute, while Puech records that some of the MSS. which he investigated contain complete Coptic translations of the *Logia Jesou*, fragments of which are preserved in the Oxyrhynchus papyri.

[12] An account of it will be found in H. C. Puech-G. Quispel, 'Les Écrits Gnostiques du Codex Jung', in: *Vigiliae Christianae* VIII (1954), pp. 1-7, followed by a detailed analysis of the first three treatises; the fourth will be the subject of a later article. In preparing the present communication, I have been able, by the kindness of Dr. Quispel, to make use of the proofs of this article before its publication.

[13] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III 11:9: *Hi vero qui sunt a Valentino iterum existentes extra omnem timorem suas conscriptiones proferentes plura habere gloriantur quam sint ipsa evangelia. Siquidem in tantum processerunt audaciae uti quod ab his non olim conscriptum est Veritatis Evangelium titulent, in nihilo conveniens apostolorum evangeliis, ut nec evangelium quidem sit apud eos sine blasphemia. Si enim quod ab eis profertur veritatis est evangelium, dissimile est autem hoc illis quae ab apostolis nobis tradita sunt; qui volunt possunt discere, quemadmodum ex ipsis Scripturis ostenditur, iam non esse id quod ab apostolis traditum est veritatis evangelium.*

[14] According to T. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Erlangen 1888, i, p. 749, note 3, Origen refers to this Gospel on a few occasions, but he tells us only that it was a Gospel in circulation among the Valentinians; the μεταχαράσσω, which Origen uses in *Contra Celsum* II 27, can be given many interpretations. If the statement in *ad Luc.* 10:25 ff. has been accurately handed down, this cannot refer to the *Evangelium Veritatis* where no reference to or citation from this is to be found.

[15] A few examples of this in Puech-Quispel, op. cit., pp. 24-6.

[16] The best collection of what is handed down about Valentinus' life is still that of A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Litteratur bis Eusebius*, I. Theil: *Die Ueberlieferung und der Bestand*, Leipzig 1893, pp. 174-84; cf. also E. Preuschen, 'Valentinus Gnostiker' in: J. J. Herzog-A. Hauck, *Realencyklopädie für protestantische Theologie und Kirche*[3], vol. xx, Leipzig 1908, pp. 395 ff.

[17] Clement Alex., *Strom.* VII 17:106.

[18] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III 4:3 Οὐαλεντῖνος μὲν γὰρ ἦλθεν εἰς Ῥώμην ἐπὶ Ὑγίνου· ἤκμασε δὲ ἐπὶ Πίου, καὶ παρέμεινεν ἕως Ἀνικήτου.

[19] Justin, *Dial. c. Tryphone* 35.

[20] Tertullian, *Adv. Valentinianos* 4.

[21] *Adv. Valent.* 4.

[22] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I 11:1 ἴδωμεν νῦν καὶ τὴν τούτων ἄστατον γνώμην, δύο που καὶ τριῶν ὄντων, πῶς περὶ τῶν αὐτῶν οὐ τὰ αὐτὰ λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ τοῖς πράγμασι καὶ τοῖς ὀνόμασιν ἐναντία ἀποφαίνονται; cf. also I 18:1 καὶ περὶ μὲν τῆς κτίσεως τοιαῦτα λέγοντες, καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν ἐπιγεννᾷ ἕκαστος αὐτῶν, καθὼς δύναται, καινότερόν <τι>. τέλειος γὰρ οὐδεὶς ὁ μὴ μεγάλα ψεύσματα παρ' αὐτοῖς καρποφορήσας and I 21:5 *Quum autem discrepent ab invicem et doctrina et traditione, et qui recentiores eorum agnoscuntur, affectant per singulos dies novum aliquid adinvenire et fructificare, quod nunquam quisquam excogitavit; durum est omnium describere sententias.*

[23] The more significant are collected in W. Völker, *Quellen zur Geschichte der christlichen Gnosis*, Tübingen 1932, pp. 57-60.

[24] *Adv. Valent.* 1.

[25] Hippolytus, *Refutatio* V 35.

[26] Cf. Harnack, *Geschichte*, I. Theil, p. 174.

[27] Cf. further Puech-Quispel, op. cit., pp. 27-31.

[28] It may be observed here as a curiosity that R. A. Lipsius made this conjecture three-quarters of a century ago. Cf. his remarks in his art. 'Gospels, Apocryphal', in: W. Smith-H. Wace, *A Dictionary of Christian Biography*, II, 1880, p. 717: "It was probably rather a dogmatic exposition of the speculative tenets of Valentinus than a historical writing".

[29] As we find this e.g. in the *Gospel of Thomas*, which is preserved in the library of Nag Hammadi.

[30] As is well known, the Gk. text of *Adv. Haer.* as a separate work has been lost, but it is partly preserved by Epiphanius. In Hippolytus, *Ref.* VI 52 there are some small differences: διὸ δὴ καὶ φυγεῖν αὐτοὺς διὰ τῆς γνώσεως τὴν τῶν ἐνενήκοντα ἐννέα χώραν, τουτέστι τὸ ὑστέρημα, τύπον ἀριστερᾶς χειρός, μεταδιώκειν δὲ τὸ ἕν, ὃ προστεθὲν τοῖς ἐνενηκονταεννέα εἰς τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοὺς χεῖρα μετέστησε. [citations of Irenaeus are from Massuet. Ed.]

[31] Dr. Dijksterhuis was kind enough to draw my attention to the solution of this question in K. Menninger, *Zahlwort und Ziffer*, Breslau 1934, pp. 140-53, where the complete text of Bede is printed, with some later illustrations. That Bede goes back here to an old tradition is proved by other texts which Menninger cites. The passage from Irenaeus is not printed here, nor are some of the other texts to be found in Stieren's edition of Irenaeus. See further, Friedländer's commentary on Juvenal x 248-9: *Felix nimirum qui tot per saecula mortem distulit atque suos iam dextra computat annos.*

[32] Cf. Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 26.

[33] It may also be observed that the "calling" here is more general than e.g. in Marcus, for whom οἱ τῆς κλήσεως (Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I 14:4) are equated with the *psychikoi.*

[34] Preserved in Epiphanius, *Panarion* 33: cf. Völker, loc. cit., pp. 87-93; the text in question is VII 9.

[35] See frr. 2 and 6.

[36] Cf. fr. 3, where there is mention of real eating and drinking by Christ.

[37] In this connexion it must be remembered that the accounts in the Patristic writers go back to a later phase of Valentinianism.

[38] From the mysterious ruling of the same Canon 81-2: *Arsinoi autem seu Valentini vel Miltiadis nihil in totum recipimus* (see M. J. Lagrange, *Histoire ancienne du Canon du Nouveau Testament*, Paris 1933, p. 70), little can be deduced. Zahn, loc. cit., ii, 1, p. 122 thought that allusion here was to the Psalms of Valentinus, but it may be asked—but without being in a position to give an answer—whether the reference here is not perhaps to this "Gospel", because *nihil* appears to include more than one Book and the "Gospel" which first came to notice before it was taken up into the Canon.

[39] Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* V 30:3 on Rev.: οὐδὲ γὰρ πρὸ πολλοῦ χρόνου ἑωράθη, ἀλλὰ σχεδὸν ἐπὶ τῆς ἡμετέρας γενεᾶς, πρὸς τῷ τέλει τῆς Δομετιανοῦ ἀρχῆς, from which it appears that such terms were taken in a very broad sense and Celsus, *ap.* Origen, *Contra Celsum* I 26 on Jesus: πρὸ πάνυ ὀλίγων ἐτῶν τῆς διδασκαλίας ταύτης καθηγήσασθαι.

[40] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* I 2:6 on Soter.

[41] Cf. E. J. Goodspeed, *Index Apologeticus*, Leipzig 1912, s.vv.; see e.g. *Apol.* 12:9 ὁ ἡμέτερος διδάσκαλος καὶ τοῦ πατρὸς πάντων καὶ δεσπότου θεοῦ υἱὸς καὶ ἀπόστολος ὢν I.X.—63:4 f. ὁ λόγος δὲ τοῦ θεοῦ ἐστιν ὁ υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ... καὶ ἄγγελος δὲ καλεῖται καὶ ἀπόστολος—33:7 τὸ δὲ Ἰησοῦς, ὄνομα τῇ Ἑβραίδι φωνῇ, σωτὴρ τῇ Ἑλληνίδι διαλέκτῳ δηλοῖ.—On Jesus as teacher see also many passages in W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der nt. Apokryphen* Tübingen 1909, pp. 371 ff.—On Jesus as ἀπόστολος or ἄγγελος see D. Plooy, *Studies in the Testimony Book*, Verhandelingen Kon. Akademie van Wetenschappen, Afd. Letterkunde, N.R. XXXII 2, Amsterdam 1932, pp. 45-8 and M. Werner, *Die Entstehung des christlichen Dogmas*, Bern-Leipzig 1941, pp. 326 ff.

[42] Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 61; cf. further Goodspeed, loc. cit., s.v. ὅλων, very frequent.

[43] See e.g. p. 18 the perfect Father who made the All. The All was in Him and the All had need of him—p. 19 idem.—Aristides, *Apol.* I: δι' αὐτοῦ τὰ πάντα συνέστηκεν. οὐ χρῄζει θυσίας καὶ σπονδῆς οὐδέ τινος πάντων τῶν φαινομένων· πάντα (so Syr. t.) αὐτοῦ χρῄζει.—In Aristides I draw attention also to the following expressions: c. 2 τίνες μετέχουσι τῆς ἀληθείας καὶ τίνες τῆς πλάνης; c. 8 σοφοὶ λέγοντες εἶναι ἐμωράνθησαν; c. 14 πάντα τὰ πολύθεα σεβάσματα πλάνης ἔργα καὶ ἀπωλείας; c. 15 one of Jesus' disciples came to us τὸ δόγμα κηρύττων τῆς ἀληθείας; the Christians ἔχουσι τὰς ἐντολὰς αὐτοῦ τοῦ κυρίου Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ ἐν ταῖς καρδίαις κεχαραγμένας; c. 16 *ex eis vero sunt qui circumeuntes et petentes veritatem invenerunt ... veritatis scientiam*; ὄντως οὖν αὕτη ἐστὶν ἡ ὁδὸς τῆς ἀληθείας; ὁδεύοντας γὰρ ἐν σκότει, *quod veritatem scire nolunt*, προσρήσσονται ἑαυτοῖς ὡς μεθύοντες *et concidunt* (these texts of Aristides acc. to the editions of J. Rendel Harris-J. A. Robinson and E. J. Goodspeed). I call attention to this agreement in terminology to show how dangerous it is to describe these terms as in themselves "Gnostic".

[44] Aristides, *Apol.* 17: *per ignorantiam haec feci.* Justin Martyr, *Apol.* 61:10 ὅπως μὴ ἀνάγκης τέκνα μηδὲ ἀγνοίας μένωμεν.

[45] See R. Bultmann, in: G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, I, Stuttgart 1933, pp. 117-20 and L. Cerfaux, in: Th. Klauser, *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum*, I, Lfg. 2, Leipzig 1942, pp. 186-8.

[46] Eleutherius was Bishop of Rome in the years 174-84. Tertullian's chronological datum here is in complete disagreement with the other evidence about the life of Marcion and Valentinus, both in Tertullian himself and in other writers (cf. on this above p. 167). Here, as is generally agreed, Tertullian's memory must have been at fault. He made similar errors about other historical matters (cf. A. v. Harnack, 'Tertullians Bibliothek Christlicher Schriften', in: *Sitzungsberichte der Akademie zu Berlin* 1914, pp. 303 ff., J. P. Waltzing, *Le Codex Fuldensis de Tertullien*, Liège-Paris 1914-7, p. 368 f.).

[47] I do not think that enough attention has been paid to this point, nor to the fact that the Old Testament also makes mention of "knowledge". For the whole problem of Gnosis, esp. in its relation to the Church, this would appear to me significant.

[48] F. Blass-A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*[7] Göttingen 1943, par. 165.

[49] Even where a definite polemic appears to make itself noticed, as on p. 42: 'And they did not think that He was small or despicable or wrathful', this is not so strange, if we put it side by side with Aristides, *Apol.* 1: God is ἄναρχον καὶ ἀΐδιον, ἀθάνατον καὶ ἀπροσδεῆ, ἀνώτερον πάντων τῶν παθῶν καὶ ἐλαττωμάτων, ὀργῆς τε καὶ λήθης καὶ ἀγνοίας καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν.

[50] In this matter I find myself in disagreement with the view expressed in 'Puech-Quispel (2)', p. 23 f., where it is argued that the *Gospel of Truth* should be considered as a fifth Gospel side by side with the four canonical Gospels, i.e., as the *true* Gospel. In the text I fail to discover any indications of this, though I find support for the ideas which I have developed above.

[51] G. Friedrich, in Kittel, op. cit., II, pp. 724-34, for the significance of the word εὐαγγέλιον in the New Testament and esp. pp. 733-4 about the transition in the second century. For that matter Irenaeus also speaks of the one Gospel in fourfold form: *Adv. Haer.* III 11:8 τετράμορφον καὶ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον.

[52] Cf. on this e.g. W. Kroll, *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*, Stuttgart 1924, pp. 139 ff.

[53] Rev. 5:12, 13:8.

[54] On the ideas associated with "the Book" see L. Koep, *Das himmlische Buch in Antike und Christentum*, Bonn 1952; cf. also Ps. 68 (69):29.

[55] Rev. 1:5, 3:14, 19:11.

[56] In that connexion I point also to such terms as διαθήκη καινή—ἀπολύτρωσις—οἱ κεκλημένοι in ver. 15, which are also at home in the territory of the *Gospel of Truth* and the Valentinians.

[57] Ed. Klostermann, p. 5: καὶ τότε ἀπέσπασαν τοὺς ἥλους ἀπὸ τῶν χειρῶν τοῦ κυρίου; other passages in W. Bauer, op. cit., pp. 216 f.

[58] *Dial. c. Tryphone* 97:3.

[59] Iren. I 14:6. This 'sixth hour' is derived from Jn. 19:14, which conflicts with Mk. 15:25 (some MSS., as is clear from the critical apparatus in Nestle, have therefore corrected the Markan chronology here by John or sought to link Mark to the Johannine chronology). In Mk. 15:33 the 'sixth hour' would seem to appear as the beginning of the great darkness. Cf. further W. Bauer, op. cit., p. 213 f.

[60] Melito, *Homily on the Passion* (ed. C. Bonner, 1940), p. 12:28, 13:16.

[61] This also reminds us of the style of Melito and belongs to the 'Asianisms'.

[62] Cf. also Mk. 10:45 καὶ δοῦναι τὴν ψυχὴν αὐτοῦ λύτρον ἀντὶ πολλῶν.

[63] See also Rom. 3:30 εἷς ὁ θεός which goes back to the Jewish doctrine of the "unity of God", Deut. 6:4. In Ptolemaeus, *Epistula ad Floram* VII 6 εἷς γάρ ἐστιν ἀγέννητος ὁ πατήρ, ἐξ οὗ τὰ πάντα.

[64] Here we have a line in which the New Testament is clearly steeped; cf. Rom. 5:5, 2 Cor. 4:6, 1 Pet. 3:15.

[65] It is to be observed that in Matt. the subject is the losing of the 'little ones' (verr. 10 and 14); cf. also 'the will of the Father' (ver. 14). These correspond with passages from the *Gospel of Truth.*

[66] Cf. Matt. 25:33 ff., again a parable with "sheep", it is clear that the author had a great liking for this image. The following passages are also of interest: C. Schmidt, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften*, Leipzig 1905, p. 360: "He named the region to the right the region of life and that to the left the region of death", *Odes of Solomon* 8:21 "On my right I have placed my chosen ones". Indeed this is not typically Gnostic but a very common figure in the history of religion.

[67] See e.g. p. 23: "While every letter is complete as a complete book, because the letters are written through the Unity". (See the refs. in F. M. M. Sagnard, O.P., *La Gnose valentinienne*, Paris 1947, pp. 641 and 647, s.v. ἑνότης and μονότης.)

[68] Cf. H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, Tübingen 1920, pp. 348 ff.

[69] Leipzig 1911 (*Texte und Untersuchungen*, Bd. 37, 3).

[70] *De Praescr.* 38, 7 ff.

[71] On the use of *instrumentum* for the collection of the books of the Old Testament and New Testament see T. Zahn, op. cit., vol. I, pp. 106-11.

[72] On these verbs which belong to a vast formula, cf. my art. 'De la règle μήτε ἀφελεῖν μήτε προσθεῖναι dans l'histoire du Canon', in: *V.C.* iii (1949), pp. 1-36 [reprinted *Sparsa Collecta* I, p. 123-156].

[73] Cf. also Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* III 12:12: *scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt.*

[74] E. de Faye, *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme*, Paris 1913.

[75] G. Heinrici, *Die Valentinianische Gnosis und die Heilige Schrift*, Berlin 1871; C. Barth, op. cit.

[76] In the section devoted to the History of the Canon in all "Introductions" to the New Testament the evidence for this will be found.

[77] See Lagrange, loc. cit., pp. 34-7 and 40-2.

[78] A. H. McNeile, *Introduction to the New Testament*[3], Oxford 1953, pp. 339-43.

[79] Above, pp. 165 f.

[80] Codex, p. 18.

THE ORIGIN OF THE RECENTLY DISCOVERED *APOCRYPHON JACOBI**

The origin and early growth of Christianity in Egypt are still wrapped in darkness. It is most remarkable, that neither that invaluable source of information, the Acts of the Apostles, nor the NT in general yields any positive evidence which can be connected with certainty with Egypt. This is the more striking since this country is so near to Palestine and offered a place of residence to large Jewish colonies. This unfortunate situation does not change for the greater part of the second century. Thirty years ago von Harnack had to confess: „Die empfindlichste Lücke in unserem Wissen von der ältesten Kirchengeschichte ist unsere fast vollständige Unkenntnis der Geschichte des Christentums in Alexandrien und Aegypten ... bis zum Jahre c. 180 (Episkopat des Demetrius). Erst für diese Zeit tritt für uns die alexandrinische Kirche in das Licht der Geschichte"[1]. Some names of apocryphal gospels like the Gospel according to the Hebrews and according to the Egyptians are known; the famous Gnostic leaders Basilides and Valentinus lived there; some evidence of the existence of Christianity is offered by papyri, though the survey of H. I. Bell in 1944[2] did not show a rich harvest for the period which interests us at the moment. The question whether *Barnabas* was written in Egypt is still open and the suggestion of a few scholars that 2 Clement had his home on the borders of the Nile was not favourably received[3]. Eusebius was ill-informed about that time and the great Alexandrians who were so much nearer are practically silent. According to Walter Bauer in his *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei* this was on purpose: "bis tief ins 2. Jahrhundert ist das Christentum hier ausgesprochen unorthodox"[4]. This contention has lately been challenged by Prof. Turner in *The Pattern of Christian Truth* who while conceding that "the full pattern of orthodoxy develop(ed) somewhat late", holds that "a certain shading off into heresy" exists only on "the outer-fringes of Churchlife"[5]. I wish we could speak about this matter with so much certainty, but in my opinion the scanty survivals of Egyptian Christendom, often even of extremely doubtful interpretation and setting, do not allow a decision either way.

Especially because of the great part Egypt played in the development of Christian Gnosticism in the prime both of the heretical schools of Basilides and Valentinus and of the ecclesiastical writers like Clement and Origen, it is deeply to be regretted that up till now so little evidence is available. But it may be that one day or another, perhaps in the near future, that inexhaustible store-house Egypt will suddenly provide the

materials to solve the present riddle. I do not dare to say that this happy day has dawned yet, but we may be thankful that something more has become available in recent years. And though it does not offer historical data which can only fully clear the matter and though in many respects the number of puzzles has increased, it should be borne in mind that every new piece of evidence is highly valuable, because in one way or another it covers a blank space of the immense jig-saw puzzle, and therefore requires careful examination.

Since Prof. H. C. Puech will fully discuss the importance of the library of a Gnostic sect, discovered in 1945 at Nag Hammadi and especially of the "Codex Jung" which formed part of it, it is superfluous for me to dwell upon this theme. Instead of showing the more general aspects of the subject which may better be left to so competent a scholar as Prof. Puech, I propose to pay somewhat closer attention to one particular point, viz. the hitherto unknown apocryphal writing attributed to James which forms the first part of "Codex Jung" the only one of the group which is accessible at present thanks to the work of my colleague Dr. Quispel.

Since this *Apocryphon Jacobi* belongs to a manuscript with material from genuine Gnostic sources, the presumption that it has the same origin, viz. in the school of Valentinus, does not seem too hazardous. It is, as I pointed out in my study: "The Gospel of Truth and the NT."[6], beyond reasonable doubt that the second treatise is the *Evangelium Veritatis* of the great gnostic doctor mentioned by Irenaeus, and the great part of the fourth treatise, called by the editors *On the three natures*, shows so many affinities with the teaching of Heracleon, the pupil of Valentinus that there is a good case to be made out for its deriving from the same school. But is this presumption right for the first part? It is interesting to notice that Puech and Quispel in their first detailed report[7] assign this *Apocryphon Jacobi* to a Gnostic author only with great hesitation. This raises an important question with regard to the character of Egyptian Christianity mentioned before.

Granted that the distinction between "Church and Gnosis" in the early part and middle of the second century cannot be too well defined it may be asked whether this document—if it is old—shows definite marks of Gnosticism or not; what are its character and affinities? And though I admit that many phrases in this Apocryphon are even harder to understand than the letters of our beloved brother Paul (cf. 2 Pet. 3:16), it is possible, I think, to attain a fairly sound result in the main point at issue.

The train of thought in this *apocryphon* is not quite as clear as we should wish. The contents may be summarized in this way. After a short introduction in which the author says that he James and Peter are called by the Lord 550 days after His resurrection for a special instruction he

discusses two points viz. behaviour towards persecution and the possibility of prophecy (p. 1-6). After that the Lord admonishes them to be attentive to His words, in order to come into the kingdom of heaven. He has come down in order that they may dwell with Him. He has plainly explained to them the parables, but in many ways his disciples are still without understanding. Therefore there is a variety of feelings, now there is joy, now there is sorrow. Jesus says good-bye to his disciples and will go away, but he urges them to save themselves. The end describes the ascension in a peculiar way: Jesus goes on high in a chariot of pneuma; the two disciples follow him through two heavens, but in the last one they cannot enter. They return to their fellows to tell them the Lord's message and when they are embittered James sends them away to their work, while he himself goes to Jerusalem. The main part is an urgent appeal to seek salvation and to follow Jesus to the kingdom of God.

Is this a Gnostic piece of work? It does not seem very probable. Puech-Quispel give several reasons[8], none of which seems valid to me, as a brief discussion will bring to light. This can best be done by mentioning their arguments, and expressing my objections in the following points:

1) It is possible to give it a Gnostic interpretation, but that cannot be called very stringent; the same can be said of various books in the Bible; besides that: possibility is not the same as necessity.

2) The use of Gnostic terms like "election" and "gnosis"; but these are also to be found in the NT and before this can be adduced as an argument, one should be sure that they are used here in a typically Gnostic manner.

3) Whether special revelation to some of the disciples is specifically Gnostic, seems doubtful; an interesting quotation of Irenaeus I 30:14 may have some outward similarity to our writing; if however the whole passage is read, it becomes clear that there is no connection in contents at all; if these Gnostics have known a writing like our apocryphon they have adapted it to their own ideas in the same way as they did with the NT.

4) 18 months as post-resurrection period; it is true that these numbers are found in Gnostic circles; but as von Harnack pointed out[9] this number itself must be pre-Gnostic, since they play on it like on the numbers in the NT.

5) A certain similarity between the last lines in this work and the *Evangelium Veritatis*; but the *tertium comparationis* being the idea of the children of God, we find a general Christian and not a typically Gnostic thought.

If this writing is compared with original Gnostic books such as the Valentinian *Gospel of Truth*, the *Pistis Sophia*, the *Books of Jeû* or the *Excerpta e Theodoto*, its non-Gnostic character appears the more clearly. All typical-

ly Gnostic ideas like aeons, the unknown Father, the sin as ἄγνοια, the great series of mysteries with their special names, the division between Jesus and Christ, the different classes of men are all missing. Salvation is deliverance from sin in the ἐπιθυμία and not in the flesh itself; the kingdom of God is in heaven, but we do not hear of special initiations to pass to it; to believe in the cross of Jesus is sufficient. These Gnostic books which give an answer to the questions "from where we are and where we go" (*Exc. e Theod.* 78) are totally different in their outlook.

Because the reasons brought forward with hesitation by Puech-Quispel do not seem valid to me and there is such a difference with works of undisputed Gnostic origin, it seems to me that we must look for another circle in which the *Apoc. Jac.* was made.

Who is the James the author uses as his mouth-piece? He does not give any clear indication, for the fact that he refers to another writing of his, sent 10 months before, does not offer any help up till now. Since the Nag Hammadi collection contains several other books under the same name it may be that a link between one of them and this piece will be found in the future. Up till now, however, there is no definite indication. The references to James in *Pistis Sophia* e.g. do not show the slightest similarity. One might suggest James the brother of the Lord, to whom various apocryphal works have been ascribed and who is mentioned by Clement of Alexandria, together with Peter and John as a recipient of special instruction by the Lord[10]. But it should be observed that there is no interest in Jewish matters either positive or negative in this writing. Of any special connection with Jesus there is no trace. So it is equally possible that James, the son of Zebedee, was meant, he belonging with Peter and his brother to the inner circle of Jesus' Disciples according to the Gospels and being honoured with the vision of the Transfiguration and Gethsemane. Here, too, we come to a negative statement: our apocryphon does not contain links with Palestine. There are no signs of special anti-Jewish tendencies, such as in the *Epistle of Barnabas*; further, even quotations or clear references to the OT are lacking.

In spite of diligent searching in the early Christian literature it has not yet been possible to bring this writing into one of the well-known streams of thought. Ascetic tendencies are not found here as in the Gospel of the Egyptians. Perhaps there is a connection with one agraphon when it is said twice: "save yourself", which reminds us of σώζου σὺ καὶ ἡ ψυχή σου (*Exc. e Theod.* 2), but one cannot say that this is either clear or very helpful.

Two writings however may be mentioned, because of some interesting points of agreement:

1) *2nd Clement:* there are two central ideas in this sermon which occur also as leading themes in this apocryphon, viz. *a*) the entrance in the kingdom of heaven and the conditions to enter therein; *b*) the stress on salvation—Besides that some minor points may be observed, such as: ἐλεήθητε (p. 2) = 2 Cl. 1:7 ἠλέησεν γὰρ ἡμᾶς καὶ σπλαγχνισθεὶς ἔσωσε; the comparison of Christian life with a sojourning in a foreign country; the express thought that life is short and that therefore Life must be sought for. If this is right, it would strengthen the case for the origin of this sermon (2 Clement) in Egypt and explain its curious apocryphal quotations, one of which is from the Gospel according to the Egyptians! On the other hand there are together with this fundamental agreement marked differences: the "ecclesiastical" element, references to baptism, presbyters, is lacking here; even more striking is that *A. Jac.* is completely uneschatological; the urgent appeal to μετάνοια because of the coming judgement is completely missing. This apocryphon stands as far as I can see alone in this respect.

2) The *Ascension of Isaiah:* this curious writing with its typically Christian interpolation is dated by most authors between AD 80-100, but is generally treated in a very neglectful way. It has in common with *A. Jac.*: the number of post-resurrection days 545-550; the accompanying circumstances of the Ascension; an expression like: "those who believe in my cross", and the idea that the righteous ones will become like Jesus. One cannot say, however, that one writing depends upon the other: the whole scenery and teaching is different and whereas *Asc. Is.* has 7 heavens, there are only three here. But even this independence makes the parallels more striking; a similar tradition is behind both.

As far as the NT is concerned it must be said that the Book of Acts, the only one that gives an account of the ascension is unknown. This appears from its description and the conflict of dates: 40 days against 550, though it must be said that when Acts says that Jesus spoke to His disciples τὰ περὶ τῆς βασιλείας τοῦ θεοῦ this definition can be applied to this apocryphon. The letters of Paul yield only one really striking parallelism: p. 13 I have given myself under the curse—Gal. 3:13 γενόμενος ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν κατάρα; besides that the admonition to watchfulness and against drunkenness is found, but it is too common to be of much use. Most clear of all is the fact that material now collected in the gospels is known. There are references to a number of parables, because the time Jesus is with His disciples after His resurrection seems to explain their meaning now He speaks no more in parables (cf. John 16:25) He goes away and has come down (cf. John) The disciples boast that they have left their parents etc. Unfortunately it is impossible to say whether the author possessed one or

more of our present gospels. From the well-known Papyrus Egerton 2 it is known in what a state of mixture these texts were current.

The Christology of this apocryphon has nothing "unorthodox"—Jesus came down, taught his disciples about the kingdom, was crucified and under the curse, he suffered, was raised and goes to heaven. His disciples are called to follow him, having received the Spirit as a gift from heaven. There is nothing of docetism.

Because of that number 550 the text must have been written before Acts became generally known; that is in the former half of the 2nd century. Because it does not contain references to the Jews or to the OT, it may be that the author lived after the Jewish rebellion in 135 with its massacres in Egypt or that he lived in a small village in the country. This latter supposition would explain why this writing did not come to the knowledge of Clement of Alexandria. Its author had surely a literary gift as may be seen even through the veil of translation from a comparison like this: "For the World is like a grain of seed (Matth. 13:1); when a man has seen it, he believes in it and when it sprouts, he loves it seeing many grains in it instead of one and working he is saved because he prepares it for food", in this way he explains that the Word is the origin of faith, love and works. The book is written in a time when there was no real persecution yet, but a growing tendency towards it, making the heart of the believers faint.

In combining these facts I would like to suggest that this newly discovered apocryphon originates from a small village-church not yet affected by gnosticism, between 125-150 as a word of exhortation to seek the way to the kingdom by salvation as Jesus gave it. Because it was not very concrete in its wording it became out-of-date and got lost. Because it could be interpreted in a Gnostic way these circles took hold of it, since it gave some "revelation" outside that used in the church. But it should be borne in mind that in that time Christian theology was still in a very fluid state and that it is preferable to distinguish between what is real Gnosticism and a vague, unreflected Christianity.

In formulating these conclusions I am fully aware that much in it is tentative though some facts are certain. As it is we have here a most interesting new document of Egyptian Christianity from a most obscure period, from a country so interesting in the religious life of the Roman Empire. Perhaps even these tentative conclusions may help to define more clearly the real problem of the relation between Gnosis and Christianity.

NOTES

* Short communication, read at the VIII[th] International Congress for the History of Religions, Rome 17-23 April 1955. Appeared in: *Vigiliae Christianae* X (1956), p. 149-156.

[1] A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*, Leipzig 1923, vol. II, p. 706-707.

[2] H. I. Bell, 'Evidences of Christianity in Egypt during the Roman Period' in: *Harvard Theological Review* xxxvii (1944), p. 185-208.

[3] Cf. J. Quasten, *Patrology*, Utrecht-Brussels 1951, vol. I, p. 54 and 89.

[4] W. Bauer, *Rechtgläubigkeit und Ketzerei im ältesten Christentum*, Tübingen 1934, p. 63.

[5] H. E. W. Turner, *The Pattern of Christian Truth*, London 1954, p. 59.

[6] H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, W. C. van Unnik, *The Jung Codex*, London 1955, p. 81-129. [in this Volume pp. 163-191].

[7] H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, 'Les écrits gnostiques du codex Jung', in: *Vigiliae Christianae* viii (1954), p. 7-22.

[8] H. C. Puech, G. Quispel, art. cit., p. 20-22.

[9] A. Harnack, 'Chronologische Berechnung des ,,Tages von Damaskus'' '. *Sitzungsberichte der preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Berlin*, 1912, p. 677-678.

[10] See the references in Puech, Quispel, art. cit., p. 10, n. 16.

DIE JÜDISCHE KOMPONENTE IN DER ENTSTEHUNG DER GNOSIS*

Hier soll meist das Fratzenhafte,
Das ein düsterer Wahnsinn schaffte,
Für das Allerhöchste gelten;
Sag' ich euch absurde Dinge,
Denkt, daß ich Abraxas bringe.

So sprach einmal der Mann, dessen berühmten Namen diese hochwürdige Universität trägt, als er die mystische Schwärmerei mancher seiner Zeitgenossen persiflierte[1]. Obwohl heute nicht der famöse und rätselhafte Abraxas im Mittelpunkt unserer Betrachtungen stehen wird, sondern die Gnosis im allgemeinen, mag es doch wohl als ein gefährliches Unterfangen erscheinen, im Schatten Goethes darüber zu sprechen. Ist diese Kritik nicht so scharf, daß alles Gerede über die Gnosis nur als Wahnsinn zu betrachten ist und als solcher entlarvt heißen kann? Es ist eine etwas paradoxe Situation und nicht ohne Humor: einerseits möchte ich gerne dem großen deutschen Dichter den Zoll der Ehrerbietung und Dankbarkeit entrichten, indem ich seine Weisheit mir zu Herzen zu nehme; anderseits dürfen diese höhnische Worte uns doch das Vergnügen nicht rauben, uns in das merkwürdige Phänomen, das ,,Gnosis'' heißt, zu vertiefen. Glücklicherweise werden wir aus dieser schwierigen Lage durch die Tatsache errettet, daß seit den Tagen Goethes sich auch in dieser Hinsicht manches geändert hat. Der Spuk von Geheimnistuerei und scheingelehrter Tiefsinnigkeit, der sich gnostischer Formen und Spekulationen bediente und noch im 18. Jahrhundert viele bezauberte, ist praktisch gebannt. Seither hat die wissenschaftliche Forschung sich dieses Phänomens bemächtigt, als deren Bahnbrecher wir Goethes Zeitgenosse J. L. Mosheim bezeichnen können.

Lassen wir die Nachwirkungen der Gnosis, die seit der Renaissance in vielen Kreisen ihr Wesen getrieben haben, beiseite und wenden wir uns der eigentlichen Gnosis zu. Diese Gnosis ist eine Bewegung, die im geistigen Leben der römischen Kaiserzeit während der ersten drei Jahrhunderte unserer Zeitrechnung viele Leute gefesselt hat. Eine Zeitlang hat sie sich auch ziemlich eng an die christliche Kirche angeschlossen und nach dem Zeugnis der Kirchenväter die reine Lehre des Evangeliums zu ersticken gedroht. Im Osten und Westen, in Syrien und Ägypten, in Rom und Gallien waren die Prediger und Anhänger dieser Lehre der ,,Erlösung durch Erkenntnis'' zu finden. In einer staunenerregenden

Vielgestaltigkeit oft widersprechender Formen ist sie aufgetreten. Ihren Höhepunkt fand diese Strömung im 2. Jahrhundert, eine Tatsache, die ein noch ungelöstes psychologisches Rätsel darstellt. Denn es nimmt doch wunder, daß gerade in einer Zeit der materiellen Blüte und heiteren Ruhe, dieser akosmische, die Welt absolut verdammende Lehre solch eine Anziehungskraft ausüben konnte. Das zweite Jahrhundert, nicht reich an hervorragenden Persönlichkeiten und neuen Ideen, ist doch für die Geistesgeschichte von außerordentlicher Wichtigkeit. Nie ist der Austausch von Menschen und Gedanken zwischen den Ländern des Mittelmeerraums so stark gewesen wie damals. Es ist auch die Zeit, in der die Predigt des Christentums, unbeschützt wie ein David, sich stark zu verbreiten anfängt und mit seiner Botschaft des Kreuzes in die geistige Auseinandersetzung hineingerät. Speziell der Kampf mit der Gnosis hat in vieler Hinsicht klärend gewirkt, Formen und Formulierungen geschaffen, die für die spätere Zeit bestimmend gewesen sind.

Läßt sich so die Bedeutung der Gnosis als Exponent und Triebkraft im Geistesleben der Kaiserzeit im allgemeinen nicht leicht überschätzen, so ist es mit der exakten Kenntnis von Ursprung und Entwicklung, von Verhältnissen und Einflüssen im einzelnen weit schwieriger bestellt. Die Originaldokumente dieser vielseitigen Bewegung waren im Laufe der Zeit verlorengegangen. Das war bereits im Altertum selbst im Gange: Origenes erzählt, wieviel Mühe es ihn gekostet hat, endlich eines Dokumentes der Gnosis, das von seinem Gegner Celsus angeführt wurde, habhaft zu werden[2]. Seit Jahrhunderten hat man sein Wissen nur aus den Schriften der Gegner, vor allem der Kirchenväter wie Irenäus, Tertullian und Epiphanius schöpfen müssen. Sie geben nur wenige direkte Anführungen oder Originalschriften; das meiste waren, oft ziemlich dunkle, Exzerpte. Im 19. Jahrhundert hat die Lage sich ein wenig geändert, als Hippolyts *Refutatio* in einem bedeutenden Teil wiederentdeckt wurde, wodurch die Quellenanalyse, Glanzleistung und oft auch Gefahr der goldenen Zeit der historischen und philologischen Studien, ermöglicht wurde. In derselben Zeit wurden einige gnostischen Schriften in koptischer Übersetzung veröffentlicht, die, wahrscheinlich aus dem 3. Jahrhundert stammend, sich nicht recht in das Ganze einfügen ließen. Hatte man—und es können hier große Namen wie F. C. Baur, R. A. Lipsius und A. Harnack genannt werden—anfänglich die Gnosis als eine innerchristliche Entwicklung, eine Häresie, betrachtet, so ist es das unvergeßliche Verdienst vornehmlich von Reitzenstein und Bousset, daß sie die Gnosis in den Synkretismus der Kaiserzeit hineingestellt haben, und das Verdienst bleibt ungeschmälert, wie vieles heute auch anders eingeschätzt werden muß, als sie getan haben. In den zwanziger Jahren dieses Jahrhunderts hat die Erschließung späterer Formen gnostischer

Denkweise wie des Mandäismus und des Manichäismus zu Versuchen geführt, ältere Vorstufen zu entdecken, ohne allerdings jedoch allgemein anerkannte Resultate zu erreichen.

Ohne auf die Arbeiten hervorragender Gelehrter wie des Franzosen de Faye, des Engländers Burkitt u.a.m. eingehen zu können, habe ich nur die Hauptlinien in der Entwicklung aufgezeigt und Allbekanntes erwähnt, weil nur hierdurch die Bedeutung des Fundes bei Nag-Hammadi in Oberägypten in richtiger Perspektive gesehen werden kann[3]. Diese Zufallsentdeckung, die fast gleichzeitig mit der der Rollen des Toten Meeres geschah, darf mit diesen wohl in einem Atem genannt werden. Sie gehört zu dem Wichtigsten, was seit der Erschließung des vorderen Orients durch die Altertumswissenschaft zutage gefördert wurde. Bei dem heutigen Stand unserer Kenntnisse läßt sich ihre Bedeutung noch nicht ganz einschätzen. Wir haben hier nicht ein oder zwei Bücher, sondern eine ganze Bibliothek vor uns, in der neben ganz unbekannten Werken, Schriften, deren Namen die Kirchenväter und Porphyrius überliefert haben, ohne den Inhalt mitzuteilen, zutage gekommen sind. Jetzt wird es möglich sein, die Gnosis an Originalquellen zu studieren, die Berichte der kirchlichen Autoren richtig zu würdigen, sowie Aufbau und Entwicklung einiger gnostischen Gruppen zu durchschauen. Für die Kenntnisse des gärenden Lebens innerhalb und außerhalb der christlichen Kirche der ersten drei Jahrhunderte ist das von äußerster Wichtigkeit. Hell leuchtet ein Glanzstück wie das Thomasevangelium, aber daneben darf man auch von der genauen Erforschung und Interpretation der anderen Schriften, für sich allein genommen und im Zusammenhang mit anderen gesehen, weitreichende Ergebnisse erwarten. Für die Erkenntnis der Geistesgeschichte, für das Studium geistiger Strömungen, die zusammen einen Teil unseres europäischen Erbguts formen, und das Studium der Kirchen- und Dogmengeschichte in ihrer ersten Blütezeit ist das alles — das darf man ruhig sagen — etwas wichtiger und folgenschwerer als die Entdeckung eines neuen Ruinenfeldes.

„Eine vielköpfige Hydra", so haben die kirchlichen Schriftsteller die Gnosis charakterisiert[4]. Die moderne Wissenschaft muß den alten Häresiologen hier zustimmen. Denn auch für sie ist es beinahe unmöglich, das Wesen der Gnosis genau zu bestimmen. War sie eine Philosophie? In vieler Hinsicht ja; man hat bereits im Altertum Übereinstimmungen zwischen gnostischen und philosophischen Schulen aufgezeigt und noch vor kurzem hat ein Kenner wie W. Theiler die Gnosis in die Entwicklung des Platonismus der Kaiserzeit eingereiht[5]. Aber nicht alles ist von hieraus zu erklären. War sie eine Religion? Der enge Anschluß an das Christentum weist in diese Richtung: die Gottesfrage ist fundamental, die Erlösung zentral. So konnte die Gnosis sich offenbaren in den Formen religi-

öser Philosophie, erhabener Mystik, unheimlicher Magie und pseudowissenschaftlicher Astrologie. Die Gnosis nahm sowohl die Heilige Schrift der Christen als auch Attismythen in ihren Dienst, wie die ausführliche Naassenerpredigt bei Hippolyt, *Ref.* v 7 ff. lehrt. Es ist oft ein buntes Durcheinander, ein Labyrinth, in dem es schwierig ist, den Faden zu finden.

„Eine vielköpfige Hydra": es kann nicht von *einer* gnostischen Lehre, *einem* System, *einer* Mythologie gesprochen werden. Man findet oft ganz widersprechende Aussagen. In einigen Schriften z.B. ist Iao eine Figur, die zur Welt des Anti-Göttlichen gehört und da ist er eine Gestalt unter vielen, wie im Johannes-Apokryphon; es gibt aber auch eine alte Zauberformel (der Marcosianer bei Irenäus, *adv. Haer.* I 21, 3), worin die Erlösung durch den Namen Iaos zustande gebracht wird. In einigen Büchern, die in der neuen Bibliothek gefunden sind, begegnet man sehr verwandte Mythen über die Entstehung der Welt, aber logisch sind sie nicht miteinander zu vereinbaren. Vielleicht zeigt sich das Gegensätzliche in der Gnosis am besten in der Ethik: es gibt da Gruppen, die sehr streng asketisch leben, neben anderen, die den Libertinismus bis zu Abscheulichkeiten betrieben; beides stammt wohl aus einer gemeinsamen Wurzel, nämlich der Abkehr von dieser geschaffenen Welt, die praktische Auswirkung war jedoch ganz anders.

Leider hat es im Altertum keinen Historiker der Gnosis gegeben. Im allgemeinen war diese akosmische Bewegung wenig oder gar nicht an der Geschichte interessiert. Vieles ist daher auch historisch kaum oder überhaupt nicht zu fassen. In der schriftstellerischen Produktion liebte man die Pseudepigraphie und die Autoren versteckten sich gerne in der Anonymität. Aber auch wo die Gestalten des einen oder anderen Lehrers sichtbar werden, zeigt es sich, daß sie eher eine immer wechselnde und sich ständig vermehrende Fülle von Variationen[6] als klare Auseinandersetzung angestrebt haben. Dabei muß man mit vier Tatsachen rechnen, die oft allzuleicht übersehen werden. Erstens: man hat im Altertum natürlich nicht die Presse gekannt: die schriftliche Verbreitung der Bücher war eine ziemlich kostspielige Sache; das meiste wurde mündlich überliefert und auch umgeformt. Zweitens: die Gnosis war bewußt Geheimlehre und durfte eigentlich nicht in die Öffentlichkeit gebracht werden; wenn doch etwas bekannt wurde, so war es oft reiner Zufall. Drittens: die gnostischen Schulen und Gruppen waren nicht formell miteinander verbunden in *einer* Organisation; doch haben sie sich manchmal miteinander vermischt und sich gegenseitig beeinflußt; mit der Allegorese war in dieser Hinsicht manches, fast alles zu erreichen. Viertens soll beachtet werden, daß in der heutigen wissenschaftlichen Arbeit die Quellen leicht nebeneinander auf den Schreibtisch gestellt und allgemein zugänglich ge-

macht werden können, daß sie jedoch im Altertum oftmals nichts miteinander zu tun hatten, aus ganz verschiedenen Kreisen und Zeiten stammen und nicht miteinander vermischt werden können. Wie stark die Differenzen unter den Gnostikern selbst gespürt wurden, sieht man in einer interessanten Warnung, die im 2. *Buch Jeu*, c. 43 zu lesen ist: ,,Gebet sie (diese Lehre) keinem Weibe oder irgendeinem Menschen, der in irgendeinem Glauben an diese 72 Archonten steht oder ihnen dient, noch gebet sie denen, die der achten Kraft des großen Archonten dienen, d.h. denen, welche das Blut von der Menstruation ihrer Unreinigkeit und den Samen der Männer verzehren[7], indem sie sagen; ‚Wir haben die wahre Erkenntnis erkannt und beten zum wahren Gott'. Ihr Gott aber ist schlecht''[8].

Gibt es in diesem bunten Mischmasch doch eine Einheit? Es läßt sich nicht verkennen, daß es Gruppen gegeben hat, die sich von dem Rest der Menschheit unterschieden, indem sie sich ,,Gnostici'' nannten und sich der Erkenntnis rühmten. Hier muß etwas über die Wortbedeutung gesagt werden. Es hat sich, speziell hier in Deutschland in den letzten 25 Jahren, ein Sprachgebrauch entwickelt, nach dem mit dem Begriff 'Gnosis' ,,eine religiösweltanschauliche Strömung der Spätantike, deren Wesensmerkmal die Abwertung der geschichtlichen Existenz zugunsten einer durch Eingebung von oben wiederzuerlangenden, eigentlichen, überweltlichen Existenz'' (so Goppelt[9]), oder ,,eine dualistische Erlösungsfrömmigkeit'' (so Bultmann[10]) bezeichnet wird. Bei dieser Auffassung wird der Begriff weit stärker ausgedehnt als es im Altertum selbst geschah; es werden dann ganz heterogene Elemente zusammengefaßt und die schon bestehende Verwirrung wird vergrößert anstatt verringert, weil der Begriff verschwommen wird. Es ist merkwürdig, daß Hans Jonas, der diese weite Auffassung in seinem deutschen Buch *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist* von 1934 so energisch vertreten hat, davon in seinem neuerdings in Amerika erschienenen *The Gnostic Religion* (1958) nicht spricht und mit einer mehr beschränkten Begriffsbedeutung arbeitet. Es kann nicht geleugnet werden, daß die Frage nach der menschlichen Existenz in der Gnosis von großer Wichtigkeit war, wie z.B. in der berühmten Definition bei Klemens von Alexandria[11] oder bei Hippolyt deutlich wird: ,,Der Beginn der Vollkommenheit ist die Erkenntnis der Menschen''[12]. Aber an der letzten Stelle geht es weiter mit den Worten: ,,die Erkenntnis Gottes aber ist die vollendete Vollkommenheit''. Mag auch die Frage nach der menschlichen Existenz, wie sie in der Gnosis gestellt wird, in einer gewissen Parallelität zu modernen philosophischen Strömungen stehen und mag es daher von hier aus einen gewissen Zugang zur Gnosis geben, faktisch ist die moderne Philosophie für die wissenschaftliche Untersuchung dieses Phänomens im Altertum nur sehr teilweise brauchbar.

Denn nicht die Frage der menschlichen Existenz, sondern *die Gottesfrage war in der Gnosis im Altertum entscheidend.* Nicht nur die Häresiologen, sondern auch der Neo-Platoniker Plotinus[13] haben an diesem Punkte den Unterschied gesehen. Bestimmend für alle gnostischen Systeme ist der Gedanke, daß *der höchste, eigentliche Gott* ἄγνωστος, *unerkannt und unerkennbar, sei.* Sie haben damit die Auffassung verbunden, daß *diese Welt anderswoher, von einem anderen ,,Gott'' ihren Ursprung hat. Diese Spaltung im Gottesbegriff ist für die Gnosis in all ihren oft sich widersprechenden Ausprägungen charakteristisch.* Deshalb sucht man Gnosis entweder in Religion oder Philosophie, in Magie, Astrologie oder Mythologie, eine ,,Kenntnis'', die verborgen ist, aber für die Eingeweihten nicht verborgen bleibt. Weil man überall diesen unbekannten Gott als den verborgenen anwesend wußte, so konnte er für den ,,Wissenden'' in allen Formen gefunden werden. Deshalb ist die Gnosis so weitherzig und zugleich so eintönig. Man hat gefragt, aus welchen Quellen die Gnosis entsprungen ist, und fast alle Länder im Osten des Mittelmeerraumes sind als Ursprungsland angesehen worden. Es scheint oft ein menschliches Bedürfnis zu sein, alles auf eine Wurzel zurückzuführen. Das ist hier jedoch unmöglich. Aus vielen Brunnen quillt das Wasser, sammelt sich aber in einem Becken, in dem es seine eigenartige Mischung erhält.

Im Zusammenhang mit der Frage nach den Ursprüngen der Gnosis ist in der letzten Zeit das Problem, wie weit auch das Judentum mit seiner starken Ausbreitung in der antiken Welt an die Formung der Gnosis beteiligt gewesen ist, eingehend erörtert worden. Nachdem um die Jahrhundertwende M. Friedländer ein antinomistisches Judentum als den eigentlichen Ursprung betrachtet hatte[14], aber diese These sich nicht hat durchsetzen können, weil sie der Prüfung nicht standhielt, hat man in den letzten Jahren wieder energisch auf die, wie man sagt, jüdische Heterodoxie hingewiesen (Quispel, Kretschmar[15]), und Marcel Simon hat die Aufmerksamkeit auf die jüdische Magie gelenkt[16]. Der amerikanische Forscher R. M. Grant wollte eine entscheidende Bedeutung auf das Konto der Geschehnisse um das Jahr 70 n. Chr., also des Falles von Jerusalem, schreiben: die Enttäuschung der apokalyptischen Erwartungen soll bei vielen den Gnostizismus heraufbeschworen haben[17]. Eine ruhig abwägende Übersicht wurde von dem Schotten McL. Wilson gegeben; seiner Meinung nach hat die jüdische Diaspora, wie sie bei Philo zu Worte kommt, stark vorbereitend gearbeitet[18].

Im allgemeinen läßt sich dazu folgendes sagen. Wenn man das Kapitel bei Wilson genau liest, so fällt auf, daß überall entweder die Differenzen aufgezeigt werden oder nur von einer Vorbereitung gesprochen wird, wobei vieles dem allgemeinen Zeitgeist des Synkretismus eigen ist. Das eigentliche Motiv, das den Übergang vom Judentum zum Gnostizismus

bestimmt hat, wird nirgends im Judentum gefunden. Der Zusammenbruch im Jahre 70 kann auch schwerlich als Ursache der Gnosis genannt werden. Wo die Fragen, welche diese Krise im Judentum ausgelöst hat, hörbar werden, wie im 4. Esrabuch und in der Baruchapokalypse, vernimmt man etwas anderes als Gnosis[19]. Die Erscheinungen, welche Grant in seiner Argumentation anführt, sind aus allgemein synkretistischen Motiven, nicht aus spezifisch jüdischen Voraussetzungen zu erklären. Schließlich muß ich sagen, daß der Gebrauch des Begriffes ,,jüdische Heterodoxie'' m.E. mißverständlich ist. Er suggeriert, daß es im Judentum so etwas wie eine Orthodoxie gegeben habe. Die jüdische Religion ist jedoch in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit nicht durch ein Bekenntnis im christlichen Sinne zusammengehalten. Selbst im ,,Normaljudentum'' der Rabbinen hat man die größten Verschiedenheiten in der Lehre gehabt und das war a fortiori vor dem Jahre 70 der Fall. Das Judentum ist nicht durch eine Ortho-*doxie*, sondern vielmehr durch eine Ortho-*praxie* charakterisiert. Wenn es ein Bekenntnis, das das Judentum als solches stempelt und zusammenhält, gibt, so ist es das *Sch'ma:* Jahwe ist Einer. Dieses Bekenntnis aber ist dem gnostischen Denken diametral entgegengesetzt. Gott ist im Judentum niemals der Unbekannte; wie hocherhaben Er auch sein mag, Er ist immer der Gott der Väter, der Gott der Offenbarung in der Thora. Man mag in mystischer Erhebung sich zu Ihm erheben wollen, Er ist und bleibt immer der Schöpfer und der Mensch Sein Geschöpf. Auch wo gesagt wird, daß die Engel die Welt geschaffen haben, sind sie nur dienende Geister. Die jüdische Mystik hat sich wohl in die Werke von Schöpfung und Wagen vertieft (*Maase Bereshit* und *Maase Merkaba*), aber das hat meines Wissens niemals eine Spaltung im Gottesbegriff bewirkt.

Es ist merkwürdig, daß die kirchlichen Häresiologen wohl Samaritaner, aber nicht Juden am Anfang der Gnosis nennen[20]; daß sie wohl griechische Philosophie mit dem Gnostizismus in Verbindung bringen, aber nicht das Judentum, obwohl sie doch viele Kontroversen auch mit der jüdischen Religion gehabt haben.

Auch in Blick auf unsere Frage haben die Funde von Qumran große Erwartungen erregt. Speziell ein großer dualistischer Passus im sogenannten *Manual of Discipline* ist herangezogen worden, um von einer ,,Praegnosis'' zu sprechen. Das hat sich nicht bestätigt. Und auch hier muß gesagt werden, daß ein Ausdruck wie ,,Praegnosis'' Mißverständnisse hervorruft und nicht zur wissenschaftlichen Klärung beiträgt — und dazu haben wir doch unsere Terminologie? Reicke und Davies haben gezeigt, daß, wenn in Qumran von ,,Erkenntnis'' (*da'at*) gesprochen wird, etwas ganz anderes gemeint ist[21] als mit γνῶσις bei den Gnostikern. Das läßt sich verstehen, denn die Gruppe von Qumran hat

einen verschärften Nomismus gepredigt, ein Super-Judentum, und man wirft den Außenstehenden vor, daß sie von dem in der Thora geoffenbarten Willen Gottes abgefallen sind[22].

Es ist wohl nützlich, unsere Frage an den Quellen und speziell an dem Nag-Hammadi-Fund neu zu prüfen. Inwiefern kann von einer jüdischen Komponente in den neugefundenen Texten die Rede sein?

Wenn man den Katalog der Schriften von Nag-Hammadi durchmustert, so fällt es unmittelbar auf, daß alttestamentliche Schriften und jüdische Pseudepigraphen fehlen; das ist um so merkwürdiger, als andererseits wohl heidnische Hermetica aufgenommen worden sind. Nun kann dagegen eingewandt werden, daß auch keine neutestamentlichen Schriften zu diesem Fund gehören (obwohl es viele ,,christliche Pseudepigrapha'' gibt). Wahrscheinlich stammen die Schriften aus der Bibliothek einer Gruppe, die wohl noch mit der Kirche wo man die offiziellen Bücher las, verbunden war. Der Sammler hat dann zusammengebracht, was er in der Kirche nicht fand und ihm für seine speziellen ,,Erkenntnisse'' wertvoll war. Das Fehlen sagt deshalb nicht viel, obwohl es doch merkwürdig bleibt, daß neben den vorhandenen christlichen Apokryphen die jüdischen fehlen (nur ,,Seth''-Bücher gehören zu dem Fund, aber sie sind wohl typisch gnostische Erfindungen).

Weiter kommen wir mit unserer Frage, wenn wir die einzelnen Schriften ansehen. Dabei soll man sich immer vor Augen halten, daß sie aus *christlich*-gnostischen Kreisen stammen, so daß es schon von vornherein wahrscheinlich ist, daß auch gewisse jüdische Elemente vorkommen. Es sei weiter noch bemerkt, daß man manchmal die Meinung hört, die Gnosis habe das Alte Testament verworfen. Diese Haltung findet sich z.B. bei Kerdo[23], kann aber doch nicht als allgemein-gnostisch angesehen werden. Eine Identifikation des Schöpfers und Unter-Gottes mit dem Judengott kommt in einigen Systemen vor, ist aber, wie ein Vergleich mit anderen Systemen ergibt, als sekundär zu betrachten.

Wenn man nun in diesen christlich-gnostischen Büchern nach einer jüdischen Grundlage spürt, wird man enttäuscht; man findet sehr wenig oder gar nichts.

Ein gutes Beispiel ist die Sammlung der Sprüche Jesu, das Thomas-Evangelium. In Vergleich mit den synoptischen Evangelien ist es ganz auffallend, daß hier praktisch keine Zitate aus dem AT oder Anspielungen vorkommen. Wo von den Pharisäern gesprochen wird, heißt es, daß sie eben die Schlüssel der Gnosis verborgen haben[24]. Aber eine Reaktion auf jüdische Vorstellungen und Gebräuche, wie man ihnen in den neutestamentlichen Evangelien auf Schritt und Tritt begegnet, findet man hier nicht. Dasselbe muß man in Bezug auf das *Evangelium der Wahrheit* feststellen. Man kann hier eine Menge von Anspielungen auf das NT

registrieren[25], aber nur ein einziges Mal wird man in der Ferne an das AT erinnert. Die Problematik, die in diesem ,,Evangelium'' besprochen wird, ist auch ganz verschieden von der, welche man in spätjüdischen Büchern findet. Gesetz und Volk Gottes, Sünde und Gnade sind Worte und Gedanken, die vollständig fehlen und nicht zufällig fehlen, weil es sich um ganz verschiedene Welten handelt. Auch dort, wo (wie z.B. im Brief des Ptolemäus an die Flora) die Gesetzesfrage behandelt wird, ist es deutlich, daß es eigentlich um ein Problem außerhalb der spezifischen gnostischen Lehre geht[26]. Das Resultat ist hier also deutlich negativ.

Im *Evangelium Veritatis* (p. 38) findet sich eine Spekulation über den ,,Namen'': ,,Der Name des Vaters aber ist der Sohn. Er (der Vater) ist es, der zuerst dem einen Namen gab, der aus ihm hervorging, der er selbst war und den er als Sohn hervorgebracht hat.'' In diesem Gedanken hat Quispel eine Nachblüte jüdischer Auffassungen über den ,,Namen'', wie sie z.B. in der Apokalypse Abrahams begegnen, gefunden[27]. Selbst wenn mein verehrter Kollege recht haben sollte, so muß doch betont werden, daß der jüdische Hintergrund ... weit im Hintergrund steht und stark übermalt worden ist. Einen entscheidenden Einfluß im gnostischen Denken hat das jüdische Element jedenfalls nicht gehabt. Es ist gewiß durch den Filter der Groß-Kirche hindurchgegangen.

Ganz anders liegt die Sache im sogenannten *Apokryphon des Johannes*, einem Buch, das sich einer sehr weiten Beliebtheit und Verbreitung erfreut hat[28]. Eine Analyse dieser Schrift ergibt, daß sie aus verschiedenen Schichten aufgebaut ist. Daneben ist es bedeutend und für die weitere Forschung m.E. wichtig, daß wir für dieses Apokryphon Parallelüberlieferungen sowohl im Buch *Das Wesen der Archonten* als auch u.a. bei Irenaeus besitzen[29]. Hier in diesem sethianischen Mythus liegt uns zweifelsohne eine der ältesten und ursprünglichsten gnostischen Doktrinen vor. Der Teil, der für uns jetzt von Wichtigkeit ist[30], kann als eine Art Midrasch über die Anfangskapitel der Genesis bezeichnet werden. Darin wird deutlich Gen. 1:2, der Geist, der über den Wassern schwebt, angeführt (Till, S. 131); dieser Text wird auf die gefallenene Sophia bezogen. Es ist längst bemerkt worden daß wir damit in der semitischen Sphäre sind, wo *ruach-rucha* weiblich ist und nicht neutrisch wie das griechische *pneuma*. Die Schöpfung Adams wird erzählt und dabei spielt die bekannte Schwierigkeit des Plurals in Gen. 1:27: ,,lasset *uns* schaffen'', der doppelte Schöpfungsbericht Gen. 1-2:3 und 2:4 ff. sowie der Schöpfer, der seinen Atem in Adam bläst (Gen. 2:7), eine Rolle. Man kennt hier, wie Satornil und die rabbinische Tradition, die Auffassung, daß Adam anfänglich ein kriechendes Wesen war und erst durch den in Gen. 2:7 beschriebenen Akt, lebendig wurde[31]. Der Einfluß von Genesis ist unverkennbar und die exegetischen Fragen, die hier

vorausgesetzt sind, waren im Judentum bekannt (auch bei Philo ist die Bedeutung der zwei Schöpfungsberichte erörtert). Aber — und das ist von höchster Wichtigkeit — *im Gegensatz zur rabbinischen Behandlung wird dies alles als ein Werk des Demiurgen Jaldabaoth und seiner Untergebenen beschrieben.* Damit ist die ganze Exegese gnostischer Ziele untergeordnet. Denn die Spaltung in der Gottesauffassung, die hier vorliegt, war bereits vollzogen und es soll durch diese Exegese gezeigt werden, wie Adam doch mit dem eigentlichen Gott verbunden ist, obwohl er ein Geschöpf des Jaldabaoths ist. Dazu noch zwei weitere Bemerkungen: a) aus der Erklärung, die von Gen. 1:2 ἐπεφέρετο (S. 131 Till) gegeben wird ergibt sich, daß der Verfasser einen griechischen Text gebraucht hat — b) in dieser Geschichte ist der Fall der Sophia vorausgesetzt; dieser ist aus jüdischen Voraussetzungen nicht zu erklären, denn im Judentum hat man, soweit meine Kenntnisse reichen, niemals so ungünstig über die Weisheit geurteilt; es mag sein, daß Grant Recht hat, wenn er hier eine Umformung eines alten vorderasiatischen Mythus findet[32].

Noch in anderer Hinsicht ist das Apokryphon merkwürdig: dem Genesis-Bericht wird nur bis Gen. 6 (Sintflutsgeschichte) gefolgt und danach springt das Buch unmittelbar auf Jesus über. Nur ein einziges Mal wird dabei ein Prophetenwort Jes. 6:10 zur Verurteilung der menschlichen Unwissenheit angeführt (S. 159 Till). In der Parallelversion bei Irenäus wird wohl über Patriarchen und Propheten, die dem Reiche des Demiurgen eingeordnet werden etwas gesagt. In anderen Berichten geht es nur bis zu der Geburt Seths, des Vaters der eigentlichen Kinder Gottes. M.E. hat man später den Bericht mehr oder weniger erweitert. In der Version, wie sie dem Irenäus vorlag, hat man mit einer anti-jüdischen Erweiterung zu rechnen.

Es erhebt sich die Frage, wie dieser Sachverhalt zu erklären ist. Die Antwort muß wohl darin gesucht werden, daß man nur an den Anfangskapiteln der Genesis[33] interessiert war (wie ist die heutige Welt und der Mensch in seinem Widerspruch entstanden?), aber nicht an dem weiteren Inhalt des AT. Gehässigkeiten, wie die anti-jüdische Propaganda sie auch im Altertum reichlich verbreitet hat, finden sich hier nicht. Man hat den Eindruck, daß bestimmte Leute für ihre Ziele aus dem alten Offenbarungsbuch nur die Kapitel genommen haben, die für sie interessant waren.

Es gibt in diesem Mythus eine Kombination alttestamentlicher Texte, die man oft in gnostischen Schriften findet: „Ich bin ein eifersüchtiger Gott, und neben mir gibt es keinen Gott" (Ex. 20:5 und Jes. 45:5). Diese Worte sind Ausdruck des Hochmuts des Schöpfers; er, die Fehlgeburt der Sophia, wird von seiner Mutter gewarnt vor solchem Übermut. Hierin kann man vielleicht heidnische Reaktion gegen die Ansprüche des

jüdischen Monotheismus sehen, aber in der Ausprägung, in der der Mythus uns überliefert ist, sind sie nicht Worte des Judengottes, sondern des Jaldabaoth.

In diesem Apokryphon erklärt Jesus viermal ausdrücklich ,,nicht wie Moses gesagt hat'' (S. 113, 157, 159, 187 Till). Das steht auch in der späteren Erweiterung und verrät, daß, obwohl ,,Moses'' bekannt ist, er nicht als Autorität gelten kann. Seine Offenbarung ist abgewertet, weil er nicht ,,geistlich'' ist: Adam wurde nicht von einem Schlaf, sondern von der Kenntnisunfähigkeit umfangen usw.

Schließlich sei noch etwas über die Namen gesagt, die in dieser Partie auftreten. Die bedeutenden Schlüsse, die daraus gezogen werden können, hat man bis jetzt noch nicht gezogen. Da ist zunächst Jaldabaoth als der erste Untergott; das Wort wurde noch niemals genügend erklärt, aber Quispels Deutung als ,,Sohn des Chaos''[34] scheint mir die beste zu sein; jedenfalls ist es ein semitisches Wort. Er heißt auch ,,Saklas'' (S. 123, 125 Till), eine gräzisierte Form, wie ,,Kephas'' von *Kepha*, vom aramäischen *sakla* = der Törichte[35], als solcher wird er ja auch hier beschrieben. Er wird gezeichnet als ,,von Schlangen- und Löwenaussehen'' (S. 115 Till); das sind, wie auch Grant richtig bemerkte[36], die Attribute des Mithras-Zervan und dabei könnte man eher an den persischen Lichtgott als an den Gott des AT denken. Dann ist dieser Mythus mehr eine Polemik gegen persisch-babylonische Astraltheologie als gegen das Judentum. In seinem Gefolge werden genannt: Jaoth, Eloaios, Astaphaios, Jao, Adonaios, Adoni, Sabbataios[37]. Origenes gibt aus einem ophitischen Diagramm gleichartige, wenn auch nicht ganz identische Namen[38] und auch bei Epiphanius begegnen Iao, Adonaios, Sabaoth usw. Es ist nicht schwierig, hier Gottesbezeichnungen aus dem AT wiederzuerkennen. Epiphanius hat sich mit einem gewissen Recht darüber belustigt, daß die Leute, die diese Namen gebrauchten, nicht wüßten, daß damit keine speziellen Götter bezeichnet würden, sondern daß diese Namen nur Andeutungen desselben Gottes im Hebräischen wären[39]. Origenes sagt, daß vier aus dem AT stammen und drei aus der Magie[40]. Und es ist richtig, daß wir in magischen Papyri diesen Namen auch begegnen.

Es sei darauf hingewiesen, daß alle diese ,,Götter'' unter Jaldabaoth stehen und nicht selbständig auftreten; das kann schwerlich jüdisch sein, obwohl wohl eine gewisse Verbindung mit dem AT besteht; aber welche? Später wird im *Apokr. Joh.*, S. 165, von Kain und Abel, beide von der Schlange mit Eva gezeugt — eine Legende, die sich auch in einigen späteren jüdischen Quellen findet[41] —, gesagt, daß der eine Jahve und der andere Elohim sei; in dieser allegorischen Deutung sind auch wieder die Namen des alttestamentlichen Gottes gebraucht, aber als separate

Entitäten und wohl mit einer anti-jüdischen Spitze. Als eine Art von Parallele sei hier auf den sonderbaren Gebrauch im gnostischen Baruch-Buch des Justin hingewiesen, wo von einer Heirat zwischen Elohim und Eden gesprochen wird, Engelnamen wie ,,Amen'' usw. erwähnt werden[42].

Was hat dies zu bedeuten? Ich glaube, man kann diese Beobachtungen folgendermaßen zusammenfassen:

1. Diese Namen hängen mit dem AT zusammen, aber nicht direkt; sie sind aufgenommen von Leuten, die das AT *nicht in hebräischer Sprache* lasen.

2. Diese Leute haben sie *nur vom Hörensagen* gekannt, als *nomina barbara*, und da jüdische Magie in der antiken Welt eine große Rolle spielte[43], hat diese vielleicht vermittelnd gewirkt.

3. Diese Namen sind sehr wahrscheinlich aus griechischen Übersetzungen des AT, worin sie transkribiert waren, wie noch oft in der LXX Σαβαώθ, hergeleitet.

4. Anz und Bousset haben früher schon darauf hingewiesen, daß die ,,Sieben'' aus der babylonischen Astrologie stammen[44], aber sie sind hier mit diesen quasi-alttestamenlichen Epitheta versehen.

Wohin führt uns dies alles? Es ist klar, daß man in dem Kreis, in dem dieser Mythus entstanden ist, einige Kontakte mit dem Judentum gehabt hat, daß jüdische Sagen hier bekannt waren, aber von einem direkten Einfluß des Judentums kann man nicht sprechen. Das, was man an jüdischem Gut begegnet, ist durch das Medium der griechischen Übersetzung gegangen. Das jüdische Element ist zudem stark zurückgedrängt und von anderen Vorstellungen überwuchert. Man kann weder von einem Einfluß des palästinensischen noch einem solchen des Diaspora-Judentums reden. Aber es gibt eine andere Möglichkeit.

Alle Einzelheiten, die wir bisher erörtert haben, weisen in eine Richtung: man muß doch wohl — bei der Frage nach dem ,,Ursprung'' der Gnosis — an eine Gegend denken, in der Semiten und Griechen nebeneinander lebten und in der weiter auch eine Polemik gegen persisch-babylonische Theologie einen Sinn hatte. In einer solchen Gegend, wo also östliche Einflüsse lebendig waren, ist auch ein aramäisches Element denkbar, das hier ohne Zweifel eine Rolle spielt. Teilt doch Irenäus einige gnostische Zauberformeln mit, die deutlich aramäisch sind[45].

Nun berichtet Irenäus, daß ein bedeutender gnostischer Lehrer *in Antiochia* gelebt habe, eben Satornilus, dessen Lehre stark mit dem Apokryphon Johannis verwandt ist[46]. Diese Stadt und ihre Umgebung passen ausgezeichnet. Was das Judentum betrifft, das in Antiochia von altersher stark vertreten war[47], so hat man es hier mit Leuten zu tun, die Läuten gehört haben, aber nicht wußten, wo die Glocken hingen. Sie

hatten die Hl. Schrift lesen hören. Man darf wohl fragen, ob es nicht ehemalige Proselyten oder *Gottesfürchtige* gewesen sind, die anfänglich zur Synagoge in der einen oder anderen Weise gehört haben. Josephus erzählt, daß viele von denen, die aus dem Heidentum zum Judentum übergetreten waren, später abfielen[48]. Nicht beweiskräftig, aber doch zu merkwürdig, um es in diesem Zusammenhang fortzulassen, ist das Faktum, daß bei den Kirchenvätern von einer gnostischen Gruppe der Nikolaiten gesprochen wird[49], deren Lehrer der Diakon Nikolaos gewesen sein soll; von ihm sagt *Apg* 6:5, daß er ... ein Proselyt aus Antiochia war! Wie dem auch sei, jedenfalls erklärt die Herkunft aus diesen Kreisen auch das sonderbare Faktum, daß in diesen Schriften die Polemik gegen den hellenistischen Polytheismus fehlt. Das war ein bereits längst überwundenes Stadium, man sucht den einen Gott. Aber auch die klassische Religion des Monotheismus befriedigte nicht: dieser Gott, der selbst eifersüchtig war, konnte nicht der wahre sein. Unbefriedigt mit der Welt hat man sich, aus einem starken Unbehagen heraus, nach dem unbekannten Gott gesehnt. In sich selbst fühlte man den faustischen Kampf der zwei Seelen in einer Brust. Da wurde mit allen Mitteln, die der Synkretismus bot, eine Botschaft geschaffen, die vielen den Weg zur Erkenntnis und zur Erlösung versprach, eine Botschaft die sich auch mit der Predigt des Christentums, mit Jesus als Offenbarungsträger stark verbunden hat, obwohl für Sünde und Vergebung kein Platz war.

Zusammenfassend möchten wir also sagen, daß die jüdische Komponente in der Gnosis nicht sehr stark gewesen ist und daß man nicht im Judentum von Palästina oder der Diaspora den Ursprung der Gnosis finden kann. Man soll auch nicht nach *einem* Ursprung suchen, sondern immer dem komplexen Gebilde, das wir „Synkretismus" nennen, Rechnung tragen und sich immer wieder dessen bewußt sein, daß die gnostische Bewegung keine geschlossene Einheit war und auch selbst eine Entwicklung durchgemacht hat. Das macht auch die Arbeit an diesem Problem, in deren Anfängen wir noch stehen, so schwierig, aber auch so fesselnd.

ANMERKUNGEN

* Vortrag im Katholisch-philosophischen Seminar der Universität Frankfurt am Main, 4.2.1960. Erschienen in: *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961) S. 65-82.

[1] Goethe, zitiert von A. Dieterich, *Abraxas*, Leipzig 1891, S. 154.

[2] Origenes, *contra Celsum* VI 24.

[3] Siehe darüber im allgemeinen mein Buch, *Evangelien aus dem Nilsand*, Frankfurt am Main 1959.

[4] Irenaeus, *adversus Haereses* I 28:1; 30:15; Hippolytus, *Refutatio* V 11.

[5] W. Theiler, 'Gott und Seele im kaiserzeitlichen Denken', in: *Recherches sur la tradition platonicienne*, Genève 1957, S. 74 ff.

[6] Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* I 9:5; 11:1; 21:5.

[7] Vgl. die Mitteilungen bei Epiphanius, *Panarion* XXVI 4:5.

[8] C. Schmidt — W. Till, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften* I[3], Berlin 1959, S. 303; vgl. damit auch *Pistis Sophia* c. 147, ed. Schmidt — Till, S. 251.

[9] L. Goppelt, *Christentum und Judentum im ersten und zweiten Jahrhundert*, Gütersloh 1954, S. 130, Ak. 2.

[10] R. Bultmann, *Das Urchristentum im Rahmen der antiken Religionen*, Zürich 1949, S. 181.

[11] Clemens Alex., *Excerpta ex Theodoto* 78, 2.

[12] Hippolytus, *Ref.* V 6, 6.

[13] Plotinus, *Enneades* II 9.

[14] M. Friedländer, *Der vorchristliche jüdische Gnosticismus*, Göttingen 1898.

[15] G. Quispel, 'Christliche Gnosis und jüdische Heterodoxie', in: *Evangelische Theologie* 1954, S. 1 ff. — G. Kretschmar, 'Gnosis' III, in: *R.G.G.*[3], Bd. III, Sp. 1657.

[16] M. Simon, *Verus Israel*, Paris 1948, S. 404 f.

[17] R. M. Grant, *Gnosticism and early Christianity*, New York 1959, S. 27 ff., vgl. S. 39: „Since we are now committed to the thesis that Gnosticism originated out of apocalyptic Judaism."

[18] R. McL. Wilson, *The Gnostic Problem*, London 1958, S. 172 ff.

[19] S. darüber H. Windisch, 'Der Untergang Jerusalems (anno 70) im Urteil der Christen und Juden', in: *Theologisch Tijdschrift* XLVIII (1914), S. 519 ff.

[20] Eine Ausnahme bildet die Notiz von Hegesipp bei Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* IV 22:5-7; aber Hegesipps Bericht ist sehr stark stilisiert und ohne konkrete Angaben, die eine wirkliche, historische Vergleichung ermöglichen.

[21] B. Reicke, 'Traces of Gnosticism in the Dead Sea Scrolls?', in: *New Testament Studies* I (1954), S. 137 ff.; W. D. Davies, 'Knowledge in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Matthew 11, 25-30', in: *Harvard Theological Review* (1953), S. 113 ff.

[22] Vgl. auch M. Burrows, *The Dead Scrolls*, New York 1955, S. 252 ff.

[23] Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* I 27:1: der Gott des AT ist nicht der Vaterm den Jesus verkündigte.

[24] Logion 39. — Wenn in Logion 52 über die alttestamentlichen Propheten als „die Toten" gesprochen wird, bedeutet das an sich keine Verwerfung des AT, sondern einen Hinweis darauf, daß die Präsenz Jesu die Prophetie weit überragt.

[25] Vgl. mein: 'The 'Gospel of Truth' and the New Testament', in: H. C. Puech — G. Quispel — W. C. van Unnik, *The Jung Codex*, London 1955, S. 81 ff. [Siehe oben S. 163 ff.]

[26] Ptolemaeus, *Epistula ad Floram* VII 8-9, bei: Epiphanius, *Pan.* XXXIII.

[27] G. Quispel, 'The Jung Codex and its significance', in: Puech — Quispel — van Unnik, l.c., S. 72 ff.

[28] Vgl. H. C. Puech, in: E. Hennecke — W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*[3], Tübingen 1959, Bd. I, S. 231 ff.

[29] 'Das Wesen der Archonten, übersetzt von H. M. Schenke', in: J. Leipoldt — H. M. Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag-Hamadi*, Hamburg 1960, S. 69 ff. — Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* I 30.

[30] W. C. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis 8502*, Berlin 1955, S. 113 ff.

[31] Satornil bei Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* I 24, 1 und Anmerkung von K. Holl in seiner Epiphanius-Ausgabe, I, S. 249; Rabbinisches, z.B. in *Gen. Rabb.* VIII 1; XIV 8.

[32] R. M. Grant, l.c., S. 81 ff.

[33] Ein paralleler Fall liegt im Corpus Hermeticum vor, s. C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, London 1935, S. 99 ff.

[34] G. Quispel, 'Der gnostische Anthropos und die jüdische Tradition', in: *Eranos-Jahrbuch* XXII, Zürich 1954, S. 199.

[35] G. H. Dalman, *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch*[2], Frankfurt am Main 1922, S. 291, s.v. מכלא.

[36] R. M. Grant, l.c., S. 49.

[37] Die vielen anderen Namen, die im Apokryphon Johannis erwähnt werden, können hier nicht erörtert werden.

[38] Origenes, *c. Cels.* VI 31.
[39] Epiphanius, *Pan.* XL 5:7-11, vgl. XXVI 10:11 ff.; s. schon Irenäus, *adv. Haer.* II 35:3.
[40] Origenes, *c. Cels.* VI 32.
[41] V. Aptowitzer, *Kain und Abel in der Agada*, 1922, S. 128 ff.
[42] Bei Hippolytus, *Ref.* V 26.
[43] M. Simon, l.c. S. 394 ff.
[44] W. Bousset, *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, Göttingen 1907, S. 9 ff.
[45] Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* I 21.
[46] Irenaeus, *adv. Haer.* I 24:1.
[47] Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum* VII 3:3.
[48] Josephus, *Contra Apionem* II 10.
[49] Das Material bei Th. Zahn, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Leipzig — Erlangen 1924, Bd. I, S. 265 ff.

DIE ,,ZAHL DER VOLLKOMMENEN SEELEN'' IN DER *PISTIS SOPHIA* *

Die Probleme, welche die Gnosisforschung stellt, und die für das Studium des NT und der Geschichte der alten Kirche so wichtige Frage, was die ,,Gnosis'' eigentlich war und wie sie sich entwickelte, sind seit den Funden von Nag-Hammadi in eine ganz neuen Phase gekommen. Alle Auffassungen und Theorien, welche vor 1950 aufgestellt sind, müssen als *prinzipiell* überholt und veraltet betrachtet werden, nicht weil die alten Daten nur in eine neue Betrachtung gerückt sind, sondern weil *neue Tatsachen* bekannt geworden sind und noch immer bekannt werden. Das heißt natürlich nicht, daß alles, was auf diesem Gebiete früher gearbeitet worden ist, an sich plötzlich wertlos geworden wäre. Ich möchte fast das Gegenteil behaupten. Aber alles kommt jetzt in neue Perspektive, muß revidiert und revaluiert werden, und man soll allen Theorien, welche auf den früheren Grundlagen aufgebaut sind, skeptisch gegenüber stehen.

Die Zeit für eine neue Gesamtschau der Gnosis und für eine richtige Einordnung der neuen Daten ist jedoch noch nicht gekommen. Die Texte werden erst allmählich zugänglich und bedürfen vor allem einer genauen Exegese, welche an sich durch die Schwerfälligkeit des Materials und seine verschlungenen Gedankengänge nicht einfach ist. Die Beziehungen zu altchristlichen, jüdischen und anderen, ,,heidnischen'' religiösen Vorstellungen der Zeit müssen untersucht werden. Mit dankbarer Verwendung dessen, was frühere Generationen von Forschern ans Licht gezogen haben, müssen wir in dieser Generation wieder vom Anfang an beginnen. Das *unum necessarium* in der heutige Phase der Gnosisforschung ist die exegetische Kleinarbeit, die in ständiger Selbstkritik der eigenen Arbeitshypothesen vorwärtsstrebt. Hier ist noch sehr vieles zu schaffen. Dabei soll man lieber mit den vollständig oder fast vollständig überlieferten Quellen als mit den Fragmenten anfangen und immer bedenken, daß die Gnosis nicht ein einheitliches Gebilde, sondern eine sehr vielgestaltige Größe ist.

Aber statt allgemeiner Betrachtungen über die Gnosisforschung möchte ich lieber dem verehrten Jubilar eine kleine Untersuchung anbieten, welche sich mit einer Vorstellung in *Pist. Soph.* befaßt. Dieses Buch, oder vielleicht besser, diese Bücher[1] sind eine Quelle des Gnostizismus, die über ein Jahrhundert bekannt ist. Vor allem hat sich C. Schmidt durch seine Herausgabe des Textes und einiger Übersetzungen große Verdienste für das Studium von *Pist. Soph.* erworben, aber im allgemeinen kann man nicht sagen, daß *Pist. Soph.* in der Gnosisforschung eine bedeutende

Rolle gespielt hat, obwohl sie doch in ziemlich vollständiger Form bewahrt ist[2]. A. Harnack schrieb seinerzeit: „In der Tat kann man kaum etwas Verwirrteres und Ermüdenderes lesen als diese mit den Ausgeburten der gnostischen Phantasie bedeckten Blätter, die bei flüchtigerem Studium zum Zwecke der Verbreitung des systematischen Blödsinns geschrieben zu sein scheinen"[3], und auch Leisegang spricht von einer Enttäuschung des Lesers[4]. Solche Urteile, obwohl nicht unbegründet, dürfen doch eigentlich nicht vom Studium abhalten, denn wir sollen auch die fremdartigsten Vorstellungen zu verstehen versuchen: haben doch auch sie ihre Wirkung gehabt. Man kann wohl sagen, daß *Pist. Soph.* als eine Degeneration der echten Gnosis, besonders wenn man diese von einem stark religions-philosophischen Standpunkt aus betrachtete, angesehen worden ist, und deshalb hielt man sie eigentlich nicht der Mühe eindringenden Studiums wert. Es scheint mir jedoch, vor allem im Zusammenhang mit der ganzen Neuorientierung der Gnosisforschung, daß wir auch wieder *Pist. Soph.* aufs neue untersuchen müssen, und zwar ohne Vorurteile wie „Zerfall", „Blödsinn" und Ähnliches. Nun muß gesagt werden, daß es bei einem solchen Versuch früher auch ziemlich schwierig war, *Pist. Soph.* richtig in die Entwicklung der Gnosis einzureihen, weil das Buch eigentlich einsam da stand. Jetzt, da immer mehr gnostische Quellen zur Verfügung kommen und wir besser die krause Welt der Gnosis in ihren Verästelungen kennen lernen, wird es auch möglich, *Pist. Soph.* besser als Zeuge der Gnosis zu werten.

Dieser Beitrag sei einem Thema gewidmet, das man verschiedene Male in *Pist. Soph.* findet, nämlich *die Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen.* Es wird in *Pist. Soph.* nicht gesondert, als ein spezielles Thema behandelt, worüber die Jünger, wie das in diesem Buche immer geschieht, nähere Auskünfte oder Offenbarungen erhalten. Aber diese Vorstellung wird des öfteren erwähnt in Zusammenhängen, die bemerkenswert sind und es lohnend machen, diesen Unterteil des näheren zu betrachten.

Da *Pist. Soph.* nicht nach logischen Prinzipien aufgebaut ist, erübrigt es sich, die Reihenfolge des Buches beizubehalten. Wie sich noch zeigen wird, ist die Bekanntschaft mit dieser Vorstellung vorausgesetzt. Deshalb werden die Texte in willkürlicher Form, aber mehr oder weniger nach sachlichen Gesichtspunkten geordnet, aufgeführt. Es darf noch darauf hingewiesen werden, daß die Belegstellen auf die ersten drei Bücher beschränkt sind. Das mag rein zufällig sein; es könnte auch eine kleine Bestätigung der Verschiedenheit der Bücher 1-3 von Buch 4, wie C. Schmidt sie festgestellt hat, sein. Jedenfalls gehört die Vorstellung zur letzten Phase.

Sehen wir uns jetzt die Texte an[5].

In Kap. 125 (C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 205-206) fragt Maria, ob die Menschen, die den Empfang der Mysterien in der jetzigen Zeit ablehnen und bis zu einem späteren Kreislauf hinausschieben wollen[6], nicht in der Gefahr sind, sie überhaupt nicht zu empfangen. Darauf sendet Jesus seine Jünger in die Welt, um zu verkündigen:

> „Ringet[7] darnach, auf daß ihr die Mysterien des Lichtes in dieser bedrängten Zeit empfanget und in das Lichtreich hineingehet. Nicht füget einen Tag zum andern oder einen Kreisumlauf zum andern und hoffet, daß ihr erreichet, die Mysterien zu empfangen, wenn ihr in die Welt in einem andern Kreisumlauf kommt. Und diese wissen nicht, wann die *Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen* vorhanden sein wird, denn wenn die *Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen* vorhanden sein wird, werde ich nunmehr die Tore des Lichtes verschließen, und niemand wird von dieser Stunde an hineingehen noch wird jemand darnach herausgehen, weil die *Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen* vollendet ist und das Mysterium des ersten Mysteriums vollendet ist, um dessentwillen das All entstanden ist, d.h. ich bin jenes Mysterium. Und von dieser Stunde an wird niemand zum Lichte hineingehen und niemand wird herausgehen können. Denn bei der *Vollendung der Zeit der Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen*, bevor ich Feuer an die Welt gelegt habe, auf daß es die Äonen und die Vorhänge und die Firmamente und die ganze Erde und auch alle Materien, die auf ihr sind, reinige, existiert noch die Menschheit. In jener Zeit nun wird sich noch mehr der Glaube offenbaren und die Mysterien in jenen Tagen, und viele Seelen // werden vermittelst der Kreisumläufe der Verwandlungen des Körpers kommen, und indem sie in die Welt kommen, sind einige von ihnen in dieser jetzigen Zeit, die mich gehört haben, wie ich lehrte, die werden bei der *Vollendung der Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen* die Mysterien des Lichtes finden und sie empfangen und an die Thore des Lichtes kommen und finden, daß *die Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen* vollendet ist, welches ist die Vollendung des ersten Mysteriums und die Erkenntnis des Alls. Und sie werden finden, daß ich die Thore des Lichtes verschlossen habe, und es unmöglich ist, daß jemand hineingehe oder daß jemand hinausgehe von dieser Stunde an. Jene Seelen nun werden an die Thore des Lichtes klopfen, indem sie sagen: O Herr, öffne uns. Ich werde antworten und ihnen sagen: Ich kenne euch nicht, woher ihr seid. Und sie werden mir sagen: Wir haben von Deinen Mysterien empfangen und Deine ganze Lehre vollendet, und Du hast uns auf den Straßen gelehrt. Und ich werde antworten und ihnen sagen: Ich kenne euch nicht, wer ihr seid, die ihr Täter der Ungerechtigkeit und des Bösen bis jetzt seid, deswegen geht in die äußere Finsternis. Und von jener Stunde werden sie in die äußere Finsternis gehen, dort, wo Heulen und Zähneklappern ist. — Deswegen nun verkündet der ganzen Welt und saget ihnen: Ringet darnach, der ganzen Welt und der ganzen in ihr befindlichen Materie zu entsagen, auf daß ihr die Mysterien des Lichtes empfanget, bevor *die Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen* vollendet ist, damit man euch nicht vor der Thür des Lichtthores stehen läßt und euch zu der äußeren Finsternis führt".

Es ist unmöglich, in diesem Aufsatz die hier und in den folgenden Texten gezeichneten eschatologischen Vorstellungen ausführlich zu bespre-

chen und die Verbindungslinien und Unterschiede zu anderweitigen gnostischen und großkirchlichen Eschatologien zu verfolgen. Es genügt festzustellen, daß Worte der synoptischen Eschatologie (Matth. 25:11 f.; 7:22 f.; 8:12; 22:13; Luk. 13:24 ff.) hier mit typischen Vorstellungen des gnostischen Weltbildes vereinigt sind und daran angepaßt werden. Sehr wichtig dabei ist, daß diese Jesus-Worte nicht in der einen oder anderen Form spiritualisiert werden, sondern ihre volle Wirkungskraft behalten, um zur Entscheidung anzutreiben. Die gnostische Seelenwanderungslehre legte die Möglichkeit nahe, die Entscheidung hinauszuschieben; der Ernst der Worte Jesu macht das unmöglich. Das Merkwürdige ist hier, daß also zwei Einschnitte in der eschatologischen Entwicklung bestehen: a) die Vollendung der Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen; b) die endgültige Reinigung der Welt durch Feuer. Zwischen diesen beiden Zeitpunkten besteht die Welt. Ist es möglich, dann zum Glauben zu kommen und die Mysterien zu empfangen? Das ist ausgeschlossen, denn die Türen sind schon verschlossen. Die Entscheidung fällt, wenn diese Zahl erreicht ist. Hieran sieht man deutlich, welch große Bedeutung dieser Anschauung zukommt. Die ,,Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen'' ist deutlich ein festumrissener Begriff, der sich jedoch in den Schilderungen der synoptischen Evangelien nicht findet.

Wie bedeutend für das Eschaton diese Zahl ist, sieht man in einem anderen Text, Kap. 86 (C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 126-128):

> Jesus spricht: ,,Dies alles nun, was ich euch gesagt habe, wird nicht in dieser Zeit geschehen, sondern es wird geschehen bei dem Ende (συντέλεια) des Äons, d.h. bei der Auflösung des Alls und bei dem gesamten Aufstieg der *Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen* der Erbteile des Lichtes. Vor dem Ende (συντέλεια) nun wird dieses, was ich euch gesagt habe, nicht geschehen, sondern ein jeder wird an seinem Orte sein, // in dem er von Anfang an gesetzt ist, bis die *Zahl der Einsammlung der vollkommenen Seelen* vollendet ist''. Zweimal wird nachher wiederholt: ,,bis sie alle aufsteigen, nämlich die (volle) *Zahl der Seelen* des Lichtes''. Es wird dann beschrieben, wie die Seelen alle himmlischen Orte durchschreiten und versiegelt werden. Alle Ordnungen dort bleiben // ,,bis das All hinaufgehoben wird: ein jeder vollendet seine Verwaltung, in der er gesetzt ist, inbetreff der *Einsammlung der Seelen*''.

Hier ist es bemerkenswert, daß *Pist. Soph.* sagt, diese Zahl werde eingesammelt bei der συντέλεια τοῦ αἰῶνος, welche näher interpretiert wird als ,,die Auflösung des Alls''. Damit kann man vergleichen, was Origenes sagt in *Contra Celsum* IV 57: μετὰ τὴν τοῦ κόσμου φθορὰν καὶ ἣν οἱ ἡμέτεροι λόγοι ὀνομάζουσι συντέλειαν. Es ist also eine typisch christliche Aussage, die in dieser Form nur bei Matthäus (13:39 f. 49; 24:3; 28:20) vorkommt, und zwar auch in einem eschatologischen Kontext. Vielleicht hat sie in der jüdischen Eschatologie eine Entsprechung[8]. Dabei fällt es auf, daß Origenes erst eine für die Griechen verständliche Wendung ge-

braucht, welche er nachher mit einem biblischen Wort parallelisiert; daß dagegen *Pist. Soph.* erst den christlichen Terminus gibt und diesen durch einen allgemeineren Zusatz erläutert. Jedenfalls ist es gewiß, daß dieser Ausdruck zum christlich-eschatologischen Sprachschatz gehörte. (An dieser Stelle ist nicht klar, ob *Pist. Soph.* durch Matthäus beeinflußt ist oder nicht.)

Diese Aufhebung des Alls wird auch ,,Auflösung der Mischung'' genannt (Kap. 45; C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 48, siehe unten S. 220); denn die Mischung ist die ,,Welt des Verderbens'' (Kap. 8; C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 9), weil dort die Kräfte der widergöttlichen Mächte mit dem Guten gemischt sind (so darf man wohl zusammenfassen, was in der schwülstigen Sprache der *Pist. Soph.* breit und nicht immer klar ausgeführt wird). Später wird in Kap. 25-26 beschrieben, wie diese Mächte, die als astrologische gesehen werden[9], ihres Lichtes entleert werden; ihr Licht wird gereinigt, ihre Materie wird zur Welt geschickt, wo sie zu Menschen- oder Tierseelen gemacht wird. Die Mächte jedoch widersetzen sich:

> Kap. 26, C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 22: Sie verschlingen nun ihre Materie, damit sie nicht kraftlos und schwach werden und ihre Kraft in ihnen aufhöre und ihr Reich vernichtet werde ...., sondern damit sie sich verzögern und lange Zeit verweilen bis zur *Vollendung der Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen*, welche im Lichtschatze sein werden.

Durch das Eingreifen Jesu wird dem Widerstand dieser Mächte ein Ende gemacht; auf die Frage des Philippus, weshalb Jesus die Bahn der Gestirne verwirrt hat, ob er das zur Errettung der Welt getan hat (Kap. 22; C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 19), antwortet der Erlöser:

> Kap. 23, C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 19-20: ,,Ich habe ihre Bahn zur Errettung aller Seelen gewendet .... // wenn ich nicht ihre Bahn gewendet hätte, so würde eine Menge Seelen vernichtet worden sein ... und es würden die Seelen lange Zeit außerhalb hier zugebracht haben, und die *Vollendung der Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen* würde sich verzögert haben, welche (sc. Seelen) zum Erbe der Höhe durch die Mysterien gerechnet werden und im Lichtschatze sein werden''.
>
> Vgl. damit auch Kap. 27, C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 23-24: ,,Und sie wurden auf ihrer Bahn verwirrt und nicht waren sie von jetzt ab imstande, die Materie der Hefe des Gereinigten ihres Lichtes zu ver//schlingen, und ferner habe ich ihre Zeiten und ihre Perioden verringert, damit eilends die *vollkommene Zahl der Seelen*, welche Mysterien empfangen und im Lichtschatze sein werden, *vollendet* würde. Wenn ich nun nicht ihre Läufe gewendet und wenn ich nicht ihre Perioden verringert hätte, würden sie keine Seele gelassen haben, zur Welt zu kommen, wegen der Materie ihrer Hefe, welche sie verschlingen, und sie würden viele Seelen vernichtet haben. Deswegen nun habe iche einst zu euch gesagt: ‚Ich habe die Zeiten um meiner Auserwählten willen verringert, sonst hätte keine Seele gerettet werden können'. Ich habe aber die Zeiten und Perioden verringert um der *vollkommenen Zahl der*

> *Seelen* willen, die Mysterien empfangen werden, welche sind die *Auserwählten*; und hätte ich ihre Perioden nicht verringert, so würde keine materielle Seele gerettet, sondern sie würden im Feuer verzehrt worden sein, das (sc. Feuer) sich im Fleische der Archonten befindet".

In diesem letzten Passus sieht man deutlich, daß er von einem bestimmten Jesus-Wort beeinflußt ist, das aus der altchristlichen Eschatologie stammt, aber etwas umgeformt ist, nämlich Matth. 24:22 εἰ μὴ ἐκολοβώθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· διὰ δὲ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς κολοβωθήσονται αἱ ἡμέραι ἐκεῖναι, vgl. Mark. 13:20 als Werk des Herrn: εἰ μὴ ἐκολόβωσεν κύριος τὰς ἡμέρας, οὐκ ἂν ἐσώθη πᾶσα σάρξ· ἀλλὰ διὰ τοὺς ἐκλεκτοὺς οὓς ἐξελέξατο ἐκολόβωσεν τὰς ἡμέρας. Merkwürdig ist hier die Änderung von σάρξ in ψυχή. In dem Zitat, das von C. Schmidt-W. Till merkwürdigerweise nicht angegeben wird, ist auch καιροί für ἡμέραι gelesen, aber das sind eschatologische Wechselbegriffe[10]. Der Ausdruck „vollkommene Zahl der Seelen" findet sich hier auch nicht; er ersetzt das Wort „Auserwählte".

Es ist in diesen Texten deutlich, daß die Vollendung der Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen der entscheidende Zeitpunkt ist im eschatologischen Drama. Dieser Ausdruck war offensichtlich ein bestimmter Terminus, den der Autor einsetzte bei seiner Anwendung des Jesus-Wortes im Rahmen seiner gnostischen Eschatologie.

An sich ist das Schema dieses hier geschilderten Prozesses klar; die dämonischen Stern-Mächte müssen ihre Lichtkraft abgeben, welche gereinigt wird, und ihre Materie freilassen, welche auf der Erde zu Menschen- und Tier-Seelen wird, damit diese Seelen gerettet werden; das wollen die Mächte nicht und deshalb verschlingen sie die Materie, damit keine Seelen entstehen; Jesus verwirrt die Mächte und verkürzt damit die Zeiten, sodaß sie ihr Vorhaben nicht ausführen können und doch noch Seelen gerettet werden damit die Zahl voll werde.

Wenn dies geschieht, wird Jesus als König herrschen, wie Kap. 50 C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 57 sagt: „Wenn die *vollkommene Zahl vollendet* und das All hinaufgehoben ist, werde ich im Lichtschatze sitzen und ihr selbst werdet auf zwölf Lichtkräften sitzen, bis daß wir alle Ordnungen der zwölf Erlöser an den Ort des Erbes eines jeden von ihnen wieder eingesetzt haben".

Von diesem Eintreten der Königsherrschaft Jesu wird auch an anderen Stellen, und zwar noch breiter, gesprochen:

> Kap. 96, C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 147-148 (eine Ansprache Jesu an seine Jünger): „Bei der Auflösung der Welt, d.h. wann das All hinaufgehoben wird und wann insgesamt die *Zahl der vollkommenen* Seelen hinaufgehoben wird, und wann ich König bin (mit breiter Ausführung seines Herrschaftsbereiches) .... // .. und über die ganze *Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen*, welche

Mysterien im Lichte empfangen werden, — dann werden alle Menschen, die Mysterien in dem Unaussprechlichen empfangen werden, mit mir Mitkönige[11] sein und zu meiner Rechten und zu meiner Linken in meinem Reiche sitzen..... Deswegen nun habe ich einst zu euch gesagt: Ihr werdet sitzen auf euren Thronen zu meiner Rechten und zu meiner Linken in meinem Reiche und werdet mit mir herrschen[12]. Deswegen nun habe ich mich nicht gescheut noch geschämt, euch ‚meine Brüder und meine Genossen'[13] zu heißen, weil ihr Mitkönige mit mir in meinem Reiche sein werdet''.

Kap. 45, C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 48-49 (wieder ein Wort Jesu): ,,An dem Orte, wo ich im Reiche meines Vaters sein werde, werdet auch ihr mit mir sein. Und wenn die *vollkommene Zahl vollendet* ist, damit die Mischung aufgelöst werde[14], werde ich befehlen, daß man alle tyrannischen Götter, welche das Gereinigte ihres Lichtes // nicht gegeben haben, bringe, und werde befehlen dem weisen Feuer[15], über welches die Vollkommenen übersetzen, an jenen Tyrannen zu fressen, bis daß sie das letzte Gereinigte ihres Lichtes geben''.

Kap. 98, C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 156 (wieder eine Aussage Jesu): ,,Indessen bei der Auflösung des Alls, d.h. wenn die *Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen vollendet* und das Mysterium (um dessentwillen) das All überhaupt entstanden, vollendet ist, werde ich 1000 Jahre[16] gemäß den Jahren des Lichtes zubringen, indem ich König bin über alle Emanationen des Lichtes und über die *ganze Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen*, die alle Mysterien empfangen haben''. Im nächsten Kapitel wird dann mitgeteilt, daß ein Lichtjahr 365 000 irdische Jahre umfaßt; die Herrschaft Jesu wird in fast denselben Worten wie in Kap. 96 (oben) beschrieben; er herrscht auch über ,,die *ganze Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen*''.

Aus diesen Anführungen[17] geht hervor, wie das ganze Bild des letzten Dramas hier von altchristlichen eschatologischen Vorstellungen bestimmt und abhängig ist. Nicht nur wird auf frühere Worte Jesu, die mit synoptischen fast identisch sind, verwiesen, sondern der Verfasser ist auch Chiliast, wobei man zweifeln kann, ob er direkt von Apok. 20 abhängig ist oder vielmehr diese Vorstellung vom tausendjährigen Reich mit der allgemein herrschenden Eschatologie des 2. Jahrhunderts teilte[18].

In diesem ganzen eschatologischen Aufriß, der natürlich dem gnostischen Weltbild angepaßt worden ist, aber noch deutlich unter der leichten Tünche der gnostischen Sprache hindurchschimmert, spielt auch dieser Begriff ,,Zahl der vollkommenen Seelen'' eine große Rolle. Die Vollendung dieser Zahl ist der Endtermin; dann fängt das Reich Christi über diese Zahl der Seelen usw. an bis zur endgültigen Reinigung der Welt durch Feuer. Damit die Vollendung eilends zu Stande komme, müssen die Zeiten verkürzt werden[19]. Der Ausdruck tritt immer in einer fast formelhaften Wendung auf, ist ein *terminus technicus*, war als solcher bekannt und wird nicht näher erläutert. Es wird auch nicht gesagt, wie groß die Zahl ist; es ist eine geheimnisvolle Größe, die jedoch die ,,Auflösung des Alls'' markiert.

Woher stammt diese Vorstellung? Der feste Zusammenhang, in dem sie steht als Drehpunkt im endzeitlichen Geschehen, legt es nahe, auch hier an die gemein-christliche Eschatologie zu denken. *Pist. Soph.* führt in Verbindung mit diesem Ausdruck keine neutestamentlichen Texte an. Das Nächstliegende im NT, woran man denken kann, ist Apok. 6:11, aber dort wird nur von einer „Zahl der Märtyrer" gesprochen; jedenfalls wird auch hier gesagt, daß die Zahl voll sein muß, um das Urteil Gottes wirksam zu machen.

In der christlichen Literatur des 2. und 3. Jahrhunderts gibt es bestimmte Zeugnisse, die von einer „Zahl der Auserwählten" oder „Geretteten" sprechen. Diese Vorstellung ist schon in 1 Clem. vorhanden (2:4; 58:2; 59:2), und die Weise, in der dort von dieser Zahl gesprochen wird, zeigt, daß es eine bekannte Vorstellung war. Da ich diese Texte schon anderswo besprochen habe[20], erübrigt sich hier eine eingehende Behandlung. Es sei nur auf das merkwürdige Zeugnis Justins des Märtyrers, *Apologie* I 45:1 hingewiesen: ἕως ἂν πατάξῃ τοὺς ἐχθραίνοντας αὐτῷ δαίμονας καὶ συντελεσθῇ ὁ ἀριθμὸς τῶν προεγνωσμένων αὐτῷ ἀγαθῶν γινομένων καὶ ἐναρέτων; diese Erweiterung des Testimoniums Ps. 110:1-2 zeigt, daß es nicht eine persönliche Meinung Justins ist, sondern zum festen dogmatischen Bestand der Eschatologie gehörte. Hier ist es also auch ein bestimmter Zeitpunkt, an dem das Ende eintritt. Daneben sei noch verwiesen auf *Didascalia Apostolorum* 21 (*Constitutiones Apostolorum* v 15:3), wo πλήρωμα τοῦ ἀριθμοῦ τῶν σῳζομένων auch ein Zeittermin ist[21]. Auch in diesen Texten wird nicht gesagt, wie groß die Zahl ist.

Es ist deutlich, daß in *Pist. Soph.* der Ausdruck der gnostischen Terminologie angeglichen ist. Der Verfasser (oder sein Kreis) konnte beim Wort σῳζόμενοι anknüpfen und dies gnostisch interpretieren. Aus *Pist. Soph.* 27 (oben S. 218 f.) geht hervor, wie die ἐκλεκτοί für ihn mit den „vollkommenen Seelen" gleichbedeutend sind. Das Wort „Seelen" findet sich in den bis jetzt bekannten christlichen Texten nicht.

Es läßt sich die Frage stellen, ob hier vielleicht jüdischer Einfluß vorliegt. G. Scholem hat seinerzeit eine jüdische Formel in den koptisch-gnostischen Schriften nachgewiesen[22]. Und in jüdisch-apokalyptischen Texten findet sich auch diese Vorstellung von einer gewissen Zahl, die voll gemacht sein soll im Zusammenhang mit der Endzeit[23]. R. H. Charles hat auf einige Stellen in der rabbinischen Literatur hingewiesen[24]; dabei ist von „Seelen" die Rede, und es wird gesagt (Gen. r. 24): „Nimmer kommt der König, der Messias, eher, als bis alle Seelen erschaffen sind, die im Gedanken (Gottes) aufgestiegen sind, um (dereinst) erschaffen zu werden"[25]. Aber es scheint mir doch nicht, daß hier direkter Einfluß und Bekanntschaft mit jüdischen Vorstellungen vorliegt, denn die jüdischen Texte zeigen nicht solch eine feste Formulierung wie die

christlichen, und vor allem ist hier ausschlaggebend, daß *Pist. Soph.* in ihren eschatologischen Schilderungen so ganz und gar von der gemeinchristlichen Eschatologie abhängig ist. Wenn hier ein Zusammenhang mit jüdischen Vorstellungen vorliegt, dann ist er durch vom Christentum aufgenommene und verbreitete eschatologische Vorstellungen vermittelt.

In dem hier untersuchten Begriff in *Pist. Soph.* haben wir also ein deutliches Zeugnis vor uns von einer Vorstellung, die auch in anderen, großkirchlichen Quellen, wenn auch nur wenig, belegt ist. Was schon von diesen anderen Quellen zu vermuten war (sie finden sich oft in Gebeten!), bestätigt sich hier: dieses Thema gehörte zum festen Bestand der christlichen Eschatologie.

Diese Untersuchung dürfte auch gezeigt haben, daß in einem Buch wie *Pist. Soph.* nicht nur Wahnsinn vorliegt, wie es beim oberflächlichen Lesen den Anschein hat; daß man durch sorgfältige Einzelexegese Einblicke bekommt in die Bildung gnostischer Systeme und in das Verhältnis zwischen gnostischer und christlicher Theologie. Nur in dieser Weise können wir weiter kommen auf dem Weg zur Lösung des Rätsels, das „Gnosis" heißt.

Es freut mich sehr, diese kleine Arbeit dem verehrten Kollegen und Jubilar zum 28. August anzubieten, zumal der Empfänger und der Geber speziell dadurch miteinander verbunden sind, daß sie beide am Sterbetag Augustins und am Geburtstag Goethes geboren sind. Proficiat!

ANMERKUNGEN

* Erschienen in: *Abraham Unser Vater. Festschrift für Otto Michel*, Leiden 1963, S. 467-477.

[1] C. Schmidt, *Pistis Sophia, ein gnostisches Originalwerk*, Leipzig 1925, hat in seiner Einleitung deutlich gezeigt, daß *Pist. Soph.* aus vier Büchern besteht. Die Bücher 1-3 sind jünger als Buch 4.

[2] Dies im Gegensatz zu vielen anderen Berichten über Gnostiker und gnostische Systeme, die nur sehr fragmentarisch überliefert sind und deshalb äußerst schwierig genau interpretiert werden können.

[3] A. Harnack, *Über das gnostische Buch Pistis Sophia*, (*TU VII 2*), Leipzig 1891, S. 1.

[4] H. Leisegang, *Die Gnosis*[2], Leipzig o.J., S. 350.

[5] *Pist. Soph.* wird hier zitiert nach C. Schmidt-W. Till, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften*, Bd. I: *Die Pistis Sophia, die beiden Bücher des Jeû, unbekanntes altgnostisches Werk*, Berlin 1959[3]; dort wird S. IX-XV die ältere Literatur angegeben.

[6] Hier findet sich die Lehre der Seelenwanderung, die in verschiedenen gnostischen Systemen vorkommt, vgl. die Verweisungen in A. Hilgenfeld, *Die Ketzergeschichte des Urchristentums*, Leipzig 1884, Register s.v.

[7] Vgl. hierzu Luk. 13:24.

[8] Siehe das Material in P. L. Schoonheim, *Een semasiologisch onderzoek van parousia met betrekking tot het gebruik in Mattheus 24*, Aalten 1953 (Dissertation-Utrecht), 10-13 (einige jüdi-

schen Quellen sind nicht in der griechischen Sprache überliefert; beim Zeugnis der *Test. XII Patr.* weiß man nicht, ob nicht christlicher Einfluß vorliegt).

[9] Über die weittragende Wirkung der Astrologie, speziell im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert, brauchen wir natürlich nicht ausführlich zu sprechen. Für *Pist. Soph.* ist dieser Gegensatz zur Astrologie sehr wichtig.

[10] Vgl. die Wörterbücher zum NT, s.vv.

[11] Vgl. 2 Tim. 2:12 und vor allem Apok. 20:4.6 (nicht von C. Schmidt-W. Till angegeben).

[12] Vgl. Matth. 19:28; Luk. 22:30.

[13] Vgl. Hebr. 2:11 (nicht von C. Schmidt-W. Till angegeben).

[14] Siehe oben S. 218.

[15] Eine in der altchristlichen Literatur weit verbreitete Vorstellung. Vgl. Minucius Felix 35:1, Tertullian, *Apologeticum* 48:14, Origenes, *in Ezechielem* 1:3, *Contra Celsum* IV 12; V 15, und im allgemeinen: C. M. Edsman, *Le Baptême de Feu*, Uppsala 1940.

[16] Vgl. Apok. 20:4 ff. (nicht von C. Schmidt-W. Till angegeben), die Vorstellung vom Tausendjährigen Reich.

[17] In Kap. 128 (C. Schmidt-W. Till, S. 212) wird beschrieben, was mit einer Seele geschieht, die die Zahl ihrer Umkreise empfangen hat, und wie sie dann aufbewahrt wird *„bis zum Aufstieg aller vollkommenen Seelen"*. Auch hier ist dieses Moment wieder das Entscheidende. Wir haben diesen Text nicht weiter besprochen, weil er mehr über die Individualeschatologie vor dem Ende spricht.

[18] Es ist allgemein bekannt, wie verbreitet der Chiliasmus im 2. Jahrhundert war, z.B. bei Papias, Justin und Irenaeus. Vgl. W. Bauer, 'Chiliasmus', *RAC* II, 1954, Spp. 1073-1078; M. Rist, 'Millennium', *The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible*, Nashville-New York 1962, III, S. 382.

[19] Hier sieht man deutlich, wie der Gnostiker das Wort für seine Zwecke zurecht macht: was in der synoptischen Apokalypse eine Verkürzung der Zeitfrist ist, wird hier zur Zerstörung der Kreisumläufe der Sterne gemacht.

[20] W. C. van Unnik, 'Le nombre des élus dans la première épître de Clément', *RHPhR* 53 (1962) S. 237-246 (Mélanges, H. Clavier). [In diesem Band S. 124 ff.] — In dieser Untersuchung habe ich bewußt das Material von *Pist. Soph.* nicht aufgenommen, weil es meines Erachtens erst an sich betrachtet werden sollte.

[21] Vgl. auch Pseud. Clem., *Recogn.* 1:42.

[22] G. Scholem, 'Über eine Formel in den koptisch-gnostischen Schriften und ihren jüdischen Ursprung', *ZNW* 30 (1931) S. 170-176.

[23] W. C. van Unnik, a.a.O., S. 242-244. [s. oben S. 126-27] — Vielleicht gehört schon äth. Hen. 47:4 hierher, wo vom Endgericht und der Freude der Heiligen die Rede ist. R. H. Charles, *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament*, Oxford 1913, Bd. II; S. 216 übersetzt hier: „the number of the righteous had been offered"; G. Beer, bei: E. Kautszch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, Tübingen 1900, Bd. II, S. 263 übersetzt: „weil die Zahl der Gerechtigkeit nahe" und erläutert: d.i. die für den Anbruch des Gerichts gesetzte Zeit, oder nach Offenb. 6:11 die bestimmte Zahl der Märtyrer, die vorhanden sein muß, bevor das Gericht kommt.

[24] R. H. Charles, *The Apocalypse of Baruch*, London 1896, S. 45 zu Apk. Bar. (Syr.) 23:5.

[25] Vgl. die Texte bei Strack-Billerbeck 2, 1924, S. 346-347.

THE RELEVANCE OF THE STUDY OF GNOSTICISM*

Very pleasant memories were brought home to Mrs. van Unnik and myself when we received the invitation for this visit to your Seminary. We remembered well the days in the beautiful spring of 1961 and the most gracious and warm reception that was given to us. Therefore we were very happy indeed to be back on the campus of Union Seminary. In the intervening years, *Interpretation* and *Scholars' Choice* have kept up the ties between us. Therefore I wish to express our deep feelings of gratitude and our hope that this visit may help to further the connections between us in our theological work on both sides of the ocean. And since we have not the means to employ a private Telstar, we must be content with the simpler device of personal presence now and then.

I was asked to lecture on some topic connected with Gnosticism and in particular to discuss, in a somewhat more elaborate form, some points that had been raised in the last chapter of my book *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings*. We can put the subject in a form more familiar to you Americans: What is the relevance of all this Gnostic stuff?

My first reaction was not one of complacency because some attention was paid to this book, but one of rejecting the suggestion. It might seem as though I, in speaking once more about Gnosticism, were harping upon one string and as though these strange birds called Gnostics were my sole preoccupation. But there was another less strictly personal reason which made me somewhat reluctant: the whole question of the relevance of this or that subject should be rejected altogether where we are thinking and speaking of scientific subjects, even in the sphere of theology.

The other day a first-year BD student put the question to me: What do you think is the relevance of systematic theology? It was at dinner, between the main dish and dessert, and even at such a time I take such a question seriously. But I do find it hard to give an answer to somebody who has, I presume, not even seen the outside of a *Handbook for Dogmatics*, let alone made a proper study of one of its chapters. So I took his question for a joke and gave an answer that tried to fit the occasion. Real study in any field—even in theology—starts with some question that, by one way or another, has struck us. Such a question is important for us, therefore it is relevant to us, but it remains to be seen whether that is so for everybody. Must everything be relevant to everybody? Life would be very tiresome if that were true. In the last few years it has been my pleasure and privilege to have close cooperation and good discussions with some scientists. It has always struck me that they were never asked

the question of what was the relevance of the problems they tackled. It was silently assumed that relevance was there somewhere, and they did not waste their costly time on such trivialities, even when dealing with highly specialized subjects. You know the story of the man who put the question, "Why is it, when you cut an apple, that the part that was white at first turns brown?" That had happened for ages, ever since people used apples, but nobody seems to have asked for the reason until this fellow did, a few decades ago. He started with the obvious but somewhat silly question. What was the relevance? Nothing but a certain curiosity. In the end, however, it turned out that he had discovered a very important vitamin! It often seems as though everyone is convinced of the importance of research when all sorts of machinery are employed. But when nothing but books are involved, the matter is highly dubious and suspect, so that it needs to show its credentials first. Real research in any area, even in theology, starts from a question and goes out with Abraham as its patron saint, of whom it is written that he "went out not knowing where he was to go". Even in theology there is so much work to do and the labourers in many fields are so few that we must trust one another and not ask for immediate results.

Theology is a very vast field with very many departments. Here, too, we can and must distinguish between basic and applied science. It is impossible that the results found in every particular field of basic study can immediately be applied to the practical work. When Tischendorf discovered the since-famous Sinaitic manuscript of the Greek Bible, the moving story of his discovery had, of course, no direct bearing on the problems which confronted the Christian churches and individuals in his days. It was very moving, and people could say, "How *very* interesting", though they could not read a single word of the document. The importance of this discovery was brought to light only after many years of hard work in the studies of scholars who linked up the analysis of the readings of this manuscript with that of others. A group of pious millionaires or ministers may be highly interested in seeing some pieces of pottery found in Palestine and dating from 1000 B.C.; but even if this broken earthenware was a part of King David's crack-pots, it would not elucidate our spiritual heritage a bit more than others would do. It all depends on the context in which these things have to be placed. What may be without significance for the chance visitor may be highly important for the expert. It often seems to me as though to ask the question of "relevance" is to assume that everybody can be an expert in every field. Here, too, there is diversity of gifts and, therefore, of tasks. Here, too, we must start on the assumption that every theologian who does spadework in a certain field has sufficient responsibility to devote his energy not to idle things but to

service in the Kingdom of God. But that does not mean that because results are not available to him in a paperback at $1.45, every freshman can sit in the judgment seat and say, "What is the relevance of all this?"

However, reluctant though I may be to discuss the question of the relevance of any given subject in general, I have undertaken the task assigned to me for this occasion. But it can only be done more or less as the basis of an *apologia pro vita mea*, in a rather personal way. I can only give you some reasons why I think it is important to spend part of my time on this matter which has become, for me, a fascinating problem.

My first answer to the question must be very personal indeed. Thirty-five years ago my highly regarded and inspiring teacher for New Testament, Dr. J. de Zwaan of Leyden, assigned to me the reading of two books on Gnosticism, Bousset's *Hauptprobleme der Gnosis*, and de Faye's *Gnostiques et Gnosticisme*, just for a study of the different methods these great scholars had employed in a field where the study of the source-material was so highly difficult. So, since my second year as a student, I have been confronted with this problem: Who were these Gnostics whom the Church Fathers of the second and third centuries considered as the greatest enemies of the faith? Later, as a minister, I was invited to write a little monograph on the subject, but the plan had to be abandoned because the publisher stopped the series in which it was due to appear. This decision was, I may confess, no difficulty for me; on the contrary, I was thankful for it because I had the feeling that the key to open the door was still missing. Why? Because of the deplorable state in which the remains of this once-flourishing movement have been preserved for us. Sources were not lacking; important studies had been devoted to it, and yet in spite of the summaries written in the handbooks for church history, it was almost impossible to get a clear picture.

Then in 1946 the great and startling find at Nag-Hamadi was made. Five years later Dr. Gilles Quispel joined our faculty at Utrecht to teach The History of the Early Church. He had studied classics and had taken his doctor's degree in a study of Tertullian's Books Against Marcion. This interest in the Gnostics led him to search for the manuscript, now known as the Jung-Codex, and to take a very active part in making accessible the Nag-Hamadi library. With Dr. H. C. Puech and others he published some of the outstanding pieces of this material. In the past 15 years I have had the great privilege of intimate collaboration with my colleague; and although neither of us shares all the opinions of the other and although we often work on different topics and different lines in this vast field, our cooperation has always been and still is one of unbroken, ever deepening friendship in which we share problems, hypotheses, possibilities, and perspectives.

So I have become more and more entangled in this study of Gnosticism, but it should be said that I do not want to live always in this hothouse of somewhat bizarre speculations; I am glad to turn my attention to other areas in and around the New Testament. Not only is it nice to have a change once in a while, but first and foremost it is always unwholesome to stick to one point only, and experience has taught me that such diversity of interest is extremely helpful. One gets to see things from different angles and often in an unexpected perspective. In the course of this lecture it will become even more clear why it is imperative to make such changes. This brief sketch may explain to you why this study of Gnosticism was gaining ascendency in my scholarly work and why it will, as far as any prophecy can be made, remain so for the future. Why is that so? The answer is very simple. Through the discovery of the Nag-Hamadi library our source-material has been and still is increasing in such measure that we have only begun to explore this country. Or should I say continent? The books themselves require careful analysis and interpretation. They put before us so many problems, great and small, that it will take a long time before they are answered in a satisfactory manner. Together with this work of exegesis go the questions of their origin, their relation to other books of this collection, and the information gained from other sources. If we take, for example, the newly discovered "Epistle to Rheginus on the Resurrection", we see that this document itself, with its relatively clear conception, must be considered as a Gnostic interpretation of the Christian hope; hence it must be seen in its relation to other Gnostic views on this subject, to the Gnostic idea of human existence, but also to the conceptions held by other Christians in the same time. But it would be completely wrong to think that this Nag-Hamadi material gives only an addition—be it very considerable—to the information we possess already or that it merely fills a number of gaps. No, we must put it this way: this abundance of new material makes it absolutely necessary to study afresh, to reassess all the old material, and to re-evaluate all statements made and all conclusions drawn in a period when this new information was yet unknown and not yet available. It is not unfair to say that all that has been said previous to 1955 on Gnosticism and its influence must be put to a very critical test. Of course the earlier conclusions are not useless, but they must be handled with the greatest caution and discrimination. We are still in the very first beginnings. The present state of affairs does not allow for sweeping statements, overall answers. Every answer we give, or try to give, is tentative and may need revision after a short time.

Gnosticism, as we see it now, was a highly complex movement with a great variety of currents and cross-currents, moving here in the realm of

religious philosophy, there in the sphere of magic. It was a movement spread over many centuries, developing in the course of the years. Perhaps it will be wise not to speak of Gnosticism in the singular, but to look upon it as a variegated, pluralistic movement. Anyhow, a good deal of what for a long time was buried, of which only very small peaks could be seen above the surface, has now come to light. And the study of it is rewarding. It commands some attention.

You will have noticed that I have moved gradually from speaking about my own personal interest in this subject to a more general point of view. That came as a matter of course. All research must have an element of personal interest, almost as a hobby. This is the only power that can save us in the desert of tedious labour which every scholar in every subject has to cross before reaching the outskirts of the Promised Land. One starts from a personal question that crosses the way or the mind, and one is guided from one point to another. But it soon becomes clear that the subject itself gives motivations far stronger than a personal whim: we tackle a certain problem, but before long we are captivated by it. This certainly happens when we are dealing with Gnosticism. So a number of reasons, differing in nature, may be given to explain why the study of this particular field is worth its while. Gnosticism does not stand alone, all by itself, isolated somewhere between heaven and earth. Though some of its adherents may give that impression, it was definitely connected with other movements. Hence, in stating these reasons we shall try to show that this study is not only important for its own sake but also that it has a bearing on other fields of study. I hope that these reasons will carry sufficient weight, so that even to those who are not directly interested it will become apparent that the unravelling of the Gnostic mysteries is not an idle game or waste of time but a work that must be done.

I

The study of Gnosticism is important, first of all, for its own sake.

Perhaps it was rather hard to study the movement before the discovery of the Nag-Hamadi library because, up to that date, most of what was to be known about it came from its opponents or came in a somewhat miserable state of transmission. Now these circumstances have been completely changed. We have—or we can get—in our hands the products of Gnostic thinking. Who were they, these first expositors of the Fourth Gospel? What were they after, these people who composed and re-edited the "Secret Book of John"? It is still extremely difficult to know exactly what Gnosticism really was. Must it be considered primarily a philosophical school, or was it a blending of all sorts of different religious

opinions? It is true that the Church Fathers took the Gnostics for the most dangerous heretics; but was that a fair judgment? According to Tertullian, the real motivation of the Gnostics was the question about the origin of evil. Another writer says that they were concerned with the question of the descent and destination of man. Whatever we may think of the solutions they proposed or of the form in which they distributed their "knowledge", it cannot be denied that such concerns are extremely important—the most vital questions that exist.

Gnosticism was concerned above all with the question of God. The true knowledge was knowledge about God and his revelation. Again we must say that they dealt with something that is decisive for all human existence. People devoting their lives and energies to such questions are not beating the air; they are not twaddlers but men who deserve part of our attention. It often strikes me as odd that much time is given to study of various aspects of primitive cultures in the Pacific area or Africa, while the products of a movement that formed a part of that culture of which we are the heirs should be left aside and neglected.

Many problems in the proper study of this area are still unsolved. Even the answer to the question, "What is Gnosticism?" has not been given so far. It would seem that each scholar has his private opinion on it, and therefore the definitions are often so conflicting (or even worse) that it seems as though scholars using the same terms are speaking of quite different things. And as we shall see presently, this confusion of tongues affects other fields also.

An important part of this work lies in the elucidation of the relation between the documents usually styled or professing themselves to be "Gnostic". It is very interesting to quote, for example, the "Odes of Solomon", Hermetic treatises, and Mandaean liturgies in one breath—but are we then combining things that did belong together? Or are we just making a hodgepodge with a very scientific appearance? Much work is still to be done both as to the composition of the texts concerned and as to their interrelation.

Another question demanding attention is that of the origin of this movement, of these schools. Where did Gnosticism spring up, find its roots? Was it a Christian heresy, as many of the Church Fathers saw it, or was it a particular development of trends in Judaism? Was it a form of Hellenized Oriental beliefs, or dit it arise from certain philosophical schools in the Hellenistic world? These questions are still not yet solved in a satisfactory manner. Along with them goes the question of why this movement so strongly appealed to many people at the time. The second century of our era, as it has been remarked, was one of the most quiet and happy periods in the whole history of mankind—and yet a train of

thought that was highly pessimistic carried away a great many followers. Here lies an interesting psychological puzzle. A close study of these and related questions will bring to light a number of facts that have not been recorded by ancient authors but which have left traces now only discoverable by a kind of detective work. They greatly help us to reconstruct parts of the spiritual world in which the message of the early Christian preachers was delivered.

The series of open questions which I have formulated may show how much work is still to be done. The extent, the impact, and the points at issue about this movement are so important in themselves that they warrant this study. But we can go even further.

II

The study of Gnosticism is important for the study of the Early Church, particularly in the second century.

The period between the death of the great apostolic leaders and the time of a man like Irenaeus is one of the most obscure, but also one of the most crucial, epochs in the development of our faith. Much that could have given us useful information has been lost; much that has been recovered is difficult to interpret. Yet, in this period, Christianity really had to find its way in the ancient world, not so much in a geographical as in a spiritual sense. It stepped outside the boundaries of Judaism and came into contact with Graeco-Roman culture. Would this unprotected little movement be absorbed in the maelstrom of syncretism? Would it be just one out of many Oriental creeds that competed with one another? Would Jesus just be one of the teachers, preaching a certain way of life, one of the semi-divine saviours showing the way to happy after-life? The message of the crucified and risen Messiah "who was put to death for our trespasses and raised for our justification" had to be made understandable in a world which did not share the underlying presuppositions of such a message.

The small communities of those who believed in Jesus Christ had to carry the burden of communicating their faith, of being separate from their fellowmen because of their loyalty to Christ. Many different questions of faith and action crossed their way, and these early Christians were no superhuman saints but just human beings to whom nothing human was alien. To be sure, they had the "Word of God" in the sacred books of the Old Testament; they had their leaders, but many a "prophet" was untrustworthy; the Gospels and apostolic epistles were in circulation, but not everywhere. If we realize into what situation Christianity had come, we see how dangerous the time really was. In that

period of ferment, expansion, experiment, and uncertainty there were a number of teachers who came forward with their Gnostic interpretations. Some of them, like the followers of Valentinus, were more attached to Christianity than others. But it is remarkable in the Gnostic texts that have come to light that they all, in one way or another, professed to be Christian. They bring into focus how diversified second-century Christianity really was. And one of the major tasks ahead is to define the relation between these Gnostic texts and other contemporaneous Christian writings. Let us not forget (because of some rather strange divisions in our textbooks) that Valentinus, Justin Martyr, and Hermas, the author of "The Shepherd", were living at the same time in the Church of Rome. In the writings of many Church Fathers we see what a great war was fought in that time: Gnosticism was seen as the great danger, even more to be feared than the pressure of the powers of the world. The important work of Irenaeus, written at the close of that period, his *Adversus Haereses* was directed against these formidable and threatening foes. Many of the sharpest products of Tertullian's wit were aimed at them. It can be argued that the first works of real theology were produced or prompted by the Gnostics. Against this background we must read the authors just mentioned; but this study of Gnosticism is also necessary to understand Hippolytus and many others. The history of the Canon of the New Testament, the Creed, and Monepiscopacy—according to von Harnack and many other students of early church history the three ramparts raised to defend the Church—can be seen in its true perspective only if we see them in their relation to Gnosticism. How great an importance must be attached to this fact may be seen from the words of the great expert in the study of the Liturgy, Dr. Jungmann, who wrote: "I must confess that for a long time I myself was unaware of this liturgical reaction. Ancient writers nowhere make mention of it. But now, after due investigation, I am persuaded that only in the light of this conflict with the forces of Gnosticism can some liturgical developments be properly explained".

III

A third reason is this: the study of Gnosticism is important for New Testament scholarship.

The warfare between the Gnostics and those who claimed to be the legitimate heirs of the apostolic teaching raged fiercely in the second century. But did it exist before that time? In other words, was Gnosticism already a dangerous movement in the first century? One may think of the fact that Irenaeus took the title of his extensive refutation from I Timothy

6:20: "... contradictions of what is falsely called knowledge." The Nicolaitans (despised by John the Seer, Apoc. 2:6, 15) were, according to some writers, followers of the deacon Nicolaus (Acts 6:5), who had fallen from the true faith. According to many ancient authors, it was the Samaritan, Simon Magus, mentioned in Acts 8, who started the Gnostic movement. Was Paul fighting against such a group of Gnostics when he wrote, " 'Knowledge' puffs up, but love builds up" (I Cor. 8:1)? Were they the pneumatics who boasted of their spiritual powers and insight? The list of such New Testament passages can easily be prolonged. From this discussion comes the question as to whether the Gnostic movement did not exist already before and outside of Christian circles and whether it was already at work in the churches during apostolic times.

It was mainly due to two lines of research that so much attention came to be focused on the relation of Gnosticism and New Testament, so sharply focused that no serious study in the interpretation of the New Testament can be done at the present time without due consideration of this Gnostic problem. In the first place, there was the work of Reitzenstein, a classical scholar himself, highly interested in the study of syncretism in the Roman Imperial period. He started from the neglected Hermetic Corpus, and his further research led him from Egypt to Iran, whence (as he thought) an "Iranian mystery of redemption" originated. The kernel of this conception was that of the "saved saviour": the saviour had come down to the earth in the power of evil and had delivered himself and human nature, which lived under the sway of evil. Research on this conception and its various ramifications was strongly stimulated—this was the second phase—by the translation of Mandaean texts by Mark Lidsbarski and by the discovery of Manichaean texts in many places all over Asia, even as far as China. In 1924 Bultmann published his famous article on the new light that might be gained from these sources for the understanding of the Fourth Gospel. A group of his pupils, who afterwards became distinguished New Testament scholars like Schlier, Käsemann, and G. Bornkamm, tried to explain some other parts of early Christian literature (Ephesians, Hebrews, Ignatian Epistles, Acts of Thomas) from this vantage. But the most fundamental book in this connection was that of Hans Jonas, *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*. Here the essence of Gnosticism was not seen in a certain myth but in a new *Daseinsverständnis*, a new understanding of human existence in contrast to the Jewish and Greek ideas. This understanding was that of a sharp dualism between this world, full of evil, and the ideal world, that of "God". Because of this not so much historical as phenomenological approach to the problem, Jonas expanded the concept of "Gnosticism" so far that even a man like Plotinus, who wrote against the Gnostics, was

forced into their company—not to mention Christians like Clement of Alexandria and Origen. This wider concept, together with the saviour myth, is that which is used by many scholars in Germany when they speak of Gnosticism. Hence much confusion of language has arisen, and it does not become clearer when people are introducing terms like proto-Gnostic, pre-Gnostic, and the like. I may refer here to a very useful and wise article by Dr. Munck in *Current Issues of the New Testament* (The *Festschrift* for Dr. O. Piper). Dr. Colpe, in his book *Die religionsgeschichtliche Schule*, challenges this whole conception, because there he brings out the view that in a very essential point Reitzenstein gave a completely mistaken interpretation. He says also that the "model" of the Gnostic myth that largely figures in many books (because it is taken over without verification in the texts) is a modern invention made up from various pieces collected from different sides. Nevertheless, the criticism must have its time to work. Many people still work with this conception of Gnosticism, which seems to be a mythical form of modern existentialism. It is held that Paul and John were to a very large extent influenced by this movement and, though their *Daseinsverständnis* was different, they took over many of its words and ideas. According to one author the idea of Paul's apostolate, for example, was determined by Gnosticism. In Gnosticism the Jewish idea of eschatology had been changed into a division of stories "on high" and "below". Time does not allow for more than a few indications of what is the matter here. But it is necessary to put you on your guard when the words "Gnostic influences", and the like, are used in New Testament scholarship—even when you find in the footnote to such an expression a most impressive array of references to all sorts of sources (which you often cannot control and which may be of completely differing value).

In the present state of our knowledge in this field, we must be very careful in using the sources. A text written by a member of the Valentinian school can hardly be used as a witness to religious beliefs existing prior to the New Testament, since beyond any doubt the Valentinians knew the books of the New Testament and had their own exegesis of them. The way in which Paul speaks of the first and last Adam at the end of 1 Corinthians 15, is quite different from the way in which the *Apocryphon of John* and other Gnostic writings speak of the forefather we all have in common. It is a mistake to say that since Adam-speculations are found in Gnostic texts Paul is either depending on or reacting against that sort of speculation. Whereas in these Gnostic books the first Adam is a heavenly figure who is later followed by the inferior, earthly Adam who has a spark of the heavenly Adam imprisoned in a worldly body, with Paul the earthly Adam (the created man who sinned) is the first, who is to

be followed by another Adam, the spiritual man from heaven. In this case we have on both sides a kind of exegesis of Genesis 1-2; that is their common basis, whereas the use made of this passage, its message or application, is totally different. So we must be very careful indeed, and we may be very grateful that the new material that has now become available will help us better to grasp the development of the Gnostic movement. And though this material may not give *direct* help for the interpretation of the New Testament, it offers a great advantage for understanding the spiritual environment of the Early Church. Much is still lying in darkness here. But the indications I have pointed out may give an idea of the great impact Gnostic studies have in the field of New Testament research both for its own sake and for the critical examination of positions taken by scholars of high reputation. In the present state of affairs, such a re-examination is imperative because the results have far-reaching consequences. Things cannot be taken for granted; there is at stake the effect on the interpretation of Paul and John and the understanding of the development of the beginnings of Christianity.

IV

The range of the study of Gnosticism is even wider, both from the historical and the psychological points of view.

In the last decades remarkable progress has been made in the study of Jewish mysticism. The leading authority in this field, Dr. Scholem of Jerusalem, has put out a number of books after his *Major Trends in Jewish Mysticism*, which are the fruits of his lifelong, independent, and highly original research. His work on the Kabbala leads him to speak of "Jewish Gnosticism". And though I, for one, am rather hesitant in making too close *historical* connections, I am sure that further investigations of the relations between these Jewish thinkers and the authors of Third Enoch and the Hekalot literature, on the one hand, and the Christian Gnostics, on the other, may yield extremely interesting results. For it can be seen in the documents that there was a relationship between the Jews and Christians, far greater than the direct witnesses attest. Long ago Dr. Scholem pointed out that the name "The Little Yao" was found in Jewish mystical treatises and in the Gnostic *Pistis Sophia.* A few months ago I found a most striking, almost literal, parallel between a passage in the Gospel of Philip and the Talmudic treatise, Sanhedrin. These examples could easily be multiplied. We are now only at the very first beginnings of finding our way through a jungle of interesting questions.

Another great movement of a different type may be mentioned next, namely, Manichaeism. This religion, founded by Mani, was a really

catholic faith, spreading from Mesopotamia to the East, as far as China, and to the West as far as Africa. For a time it had Augustine as one of its followers, although he later became its strong opponent. The material brought to light in 1930 by Carl Schmidt, though partly lost, gave us original writings in Coptic translation. Many new insights have been gained, as may be seen from the surveys of Drs. Puech and Widengren. But by no means may we say that most of the labour has been done. Here, too—although my story becomes tedious—it must be confessed that much material is still waiting for patient and persevering students, for this Manichaean religion was also catholic in this respect: its sacred literature was translated in very many languages. But a faith that could attract a mind like that of Augustine must be one that had considerable spiritual force.

Before pointing to even wider circles, drawn both by the Kabbala and Manichaeism, I wish to call your attention to yet another branch of the Gnostic tree, namely, Mandaeism, which is at present a little group in Mesopotamia. Their writings were studied in the last century by the great Semitist, Nöldeke, and particularly by my fellow-countryman, Brandt; then, as was mentioned before, Lidsbarski made them more accessible by his translations. New impetus to research in this field has been given by the work of the English Lady Drower, who has had much personal contact with the leaders of this group, and has acquired many new texts, part of which have been published in the last decade. She also gave a fine survey in her book, *The Mandaeans* (published in 1937 and lately reissued). In Eastern Germany Dr. Rudolph devoted two extensive books to the Mandaeans, with more to follow. A great many problems, especially concerning the origins of this group and their relation to other Gnostic streams, are still under discussion. From what was said before about the impact of Gnostic studies on the interpretation of the New Testament, it will have become apparent how greatly the clarification of this area may affect the study of the early Christian writings. Were these Mandaeans actually a pre-Christian baptismal sect coming from the Jordan Valley, or not? That is an issue of basic importance.

Let us now turn our eyes to other areas, and first, to the influence of Manichaeism. That religion disappeared in the West. It had, however, great influence on various medieval sects like the Bogomils in the Balkans and also, so it seems, on the Catharists, the great movement in France which gave rise to the Roman Inquisition. They were often called Neo-Manichaeans. In them we find a kind of Gnostic revival.

The Jewish Kabbala, on the other hand, was widely read in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. Mystics of the type of Jacob Boehme, Baron von Rosenroth and others were influenced by these speculations.

The Hermetic writings were intensively studied by the members of the Platonic Academy in Florence in the fifteenth century. Beneath the surface, during the ages, the stream of this thinking and speculating was reaching many circles. One may even ask if there was not a kind of "Gnostic mental attitude" even where there was no direct influence. This leads me to my last point in explaining why this field of study, strange though it may be at first sight, is so highly interesting.

V

The study of Gnosticism is important for the understanding of various movements in the present day.

Some months ago I visited one of the biggest bookstores in London. I was amazed to find a complete department there with books on astrology, yoga, secret science, and the like; it seemed as though there was a great demand for that sort of books. I have been told that many students from India buy such books, but it is hard to estimate how many non-Indians are also interested in this kind of literature. I possess a fairly new book of extracts from the Hermetic treatises, published for the use of modern adherents. A psychosophic society in Zürich has kindly sent me regularly its journal, called *Oriflamme*, in which I read some time ago of the "Ecclesia Gnostica Catholica Thelema" in Switzerland; the journal also announced the death of a gentleman who was "Rex summus Sanctissimus of all that are in the sanctuary of the Gnosis." The ancient writings find their readers even today! On an earlier occasion I drew attention to the fact that of all the publications of the Berlin Corpus of the Church Fathers the Pistis Sophia had the biggest sale and had gone into three editions in twelve years. It is no wild guess to venture that not all these copies have gone to scientific institutions. In many more or less secret religious groups these works are still honoured. And was it unfair of Dr. Harbsmeier to call the anthroposophic movement a modern gnosis? The same term can be applied, I think to the Rosicrucian Fellowship; their use of the New Testament shows a strong similarity to that of second century Gnostics.

These indications may suffice to show that here and there all over the world these ideas are still living. From another point of view, old Gnostics are still interesting. It is not by chance that the name of the famous psychiatrist, Jung, was attached to one of the Nag-Hamadi codices. In the later period of his life Jung found these documents very valuable material for his studies of the unconscious mind of man. It is quite clear that the Gnostics of old were expressing their psychology in the form of different myths and that they were deeply interested in

human existence. So it would be a fruitful line of research to study these writings from the purely psychological point of view.

Finally, let me say that I would not in the least be surprised if in the near future a new tide of Gnostic thinking were going to rise. We are on the brink of a new confrontation between Christianity and the other world religions, among them the religions of India. Will this result in new forms of syncretism, in which Gnosticism in one form or another will have its rebirth? The book *Eastern Religions and Western Thought*, which the present president of India, Dr. Radhakrishnan, wrote as a professor in Oxford, speaks about the remarkable fusion of Indian and Greek thinking in Gnosticism: "Gnosticism was one of the most powerful currents of thought which influenced Christian doctrine and practice". Dr. Radhakrishnan agrees that "the Gnostics approached the problem from a non-Christian point of view and arrive therefore at a non-Christian solution... But they accept the Christian creed and look upon themselves as Christians". Will such a fusion reappear in the future? Nobody can tell, but it does not seem impossible if one sees how favourably a man like Dr. Radhakrishnan looks upon the ancient attempt.

Conclusion

I hope that I have succeeded in showing how this Gnostic study can be viewed from different angles and how it brings us into contact with a most fascinating set of problems. I could do no more than give you a fairly brief sketch of an area which is part of the vast field called theology. The longer one labours there the more one feels the truth of the old Latin saying: *non omnia possumus omnes*. Everyone has to take his own small share. But we are always dealing with men and women who have wrestled with the great problems of humanity, with people whose concern it has been to express the revelation of God in their human existence. Both in basic and applied theological work we must say with Paul, "Now we see in a mirror dimly...Now I know in part;...". But through the wonder of Jesus Christ we may add, "...but then face to face...then I shall understand fully, even as I have been fully understood". (1 Cor. 13:12.)

* An address delivered at Union Theological Seminary in Richmond, Virginia, February 27, 1964.

THREE NOTES ON THE *GOSPEL OF PHILIP**

Various items of the great collection of gnostic books which so unexpectedly turned up in the library of Nag Hamadi have gradually been made accessible. For the time being they pose more riddles than they solve. On first reading these products of gnostic thinking may seem disappointing because of the obscurity of their language and their abstruse way of thinking. At this initial stage of the investigation and evaluation of these documents the most urgent task is the scrutiny of details. For this exegesis one must 'prendre son bien, où on le trouve', that is to say it is not sufficient to look for parallels and comments in other gnostic writings alone, but also in other directions. The gnostic systems are extremely complicated not only by their variety, their psychological turn of mind, their often fantastic exegesis of terms, but also by their comprehensiveness in religious matters, all of which received a typically gnostic stamp. Besides that, most of the Gnostics we know so far wanted to be Christians by one way or another; so for a proper understanding of their tenets the "background" must be found in writings of other, more orthodox writers.

Let me exemplify this with three notes to some sayings in the *Gospel of Philip*. This book, which is now easily accessible to English readers in Dr McL. Wilson's fine translation and commentary[1], looks like a collection of stray notes without much connexion, without indication of origin. Hence comments on this book may get the form of notes as well.

I

In Saying 47 the author explains the names of the Lord: Jesus the Nazorean, the Messiah. This last word is translated into Greek by 'Christ' and it is said "Messiah has two meanings, both Christ (the Anointed) and the measured...Christ is measured". With this may be compared, as Schenke and Wilson have done[2], Saying 19 where "Christ" is called a "revealed name" because "his name is in the Syriac the Messiah, but in the Greek it is the Christ". In S. 47 no such explanation about the languages is given, though there in commenting upon the name "Jesus" it is said that his name is a Hebrew one, meaning "redemption", so that in this saying also the name Messiah may be considered as "Hebrew".

We may leave aside the question of the exact distinction between these two languages[3], because there is no difference here as far as the point we

want to consider is concerned. It is correct to translate the Hebrew and Aramaic word "Messiah" by Christ = the Anointed One[4]. But highly interesting and intriguing is the fact that also a second translation is given, "the measured". What is the origin of this piece of linguistic wisdom?

This is a very peculiar translation. It is not found in the Onomastica[5] nor for all I know anywhere else in the rather few places in early Christian literature which use and explain the name "Messiah". Ever since the NT (cf. John 1:41, 4:25 and the use of "Christos") the translation is always "the anointed". Now Schenke referred to a second meaning of the root M SJ Ḥ in Syriac, namely, to measure[6]. This is also the case in later Hebrew, as appears from the dictionaries[7].

But the meaning of this "measured" is not further explained. Here a text from Irenaeus may bring some light. In *Adv. Haer.* IV 2:4 he quotes a saying that is usually ascribed to one of the Presbyters[8]. Speaking about the destruction of Jerusalem he argues that its time was fulfilled with the coming of the New Covenant. "For God does all things by measure and in order[9]; nothing is unmeasured with him, because nothing is out of order." Then he continues: *Et bene qui dixit ipsum immensum patrem in filio mensuratum; mensura enim patris filius, quoniam et capit eum*[10]. When we remember that *mesjiḥa* can mean either "measured" or "measure" (see note 7) this becomes clear; and there may be behind this rather bald saying of the Presbyter an explanation of the name "Christ" that was current among the early Christians.

It is a well-known fact that the title "Christ" puzzled the Greek-speaking Christians, since there was no corresponding figure to the Hebrew Messiah in Greek and Roman religion; often they replaced it by "Chrèstos" which had the same pronunciation[11]. It may be that some ingenious man discovered the possibility of the double translation.

If this is correct we must infer that this wordplay or double translation was already current in Christian circles c. 130 and that it came up in a bilingual community of Syria (Antioch?), where the Hebrew and Aramaic languages were known, but where a translation for Greeks was desirable.

II

Saying 51 runs as follows: "Vessels of glass and vessels of earthenware are made by means of fire. But if vessels of glass are broken they are made again, for they are brought into being by a breath. But vessels of earthenware, if they break, are destroyed, for they come into being without breath." In his commentary (p. 112) Dr Wilson remarks that the

difference here is between glassware and earthenware, which are both made in fire, but the one with the breath (Spirit) and the other without it. The glass vessels stand for the Gnostics, while the earthenware represent the merely material men.

So far so good. But one point is missed here, namely, that both kinds of vessel are first broken and then the difference becomes apparent. This breaking must be death. Both are made in "fire" which is clearly sexual passion. The difference comes after death, whether one shall revive or not.

In this connexion a very apt illustration is offered by the Babylonian Talmud, *Sanhedrin*, fol. 91, a passage in which the resurrection of the dead is defended against all sorts of unbelief. It reads: "In the school of R. Ismael (*c.* 135) it was taught: This can be concluded by a proof *a minori ad maius* from glass-ware: if a glass vessel which has been made through the breath of a man of flesh and blood, when it is broken, can be repaired, how much more a man of flesh and blood who has been created by the breath of the Holy One, blessed be He." Even more interesting is a story told in Midrash *Gen. Rabbah* 14: 7[12]: R. Jose b. R. Halafta (*c.* 150) went to a heretic who had lost a son and in whose house other heretics were assembled; the rabbi professed his faith in the resurrection, but the father denies it with the words of Ps. 2:9: "Thou shalt dash them in pieces like a potter's vessel". The proof from Scripture is answered by the rabbi:

> An earthen vessel is made from water and finished off with heat, while a glass vessel is made from fire and finished with fire; the one (glass) when broken can be repaired, whereas the other (man) when broken cannot be repaired! "(The glass vessel can be repaired), because it is made by blowing," said the other. "Let your ears hear what your mouth speaks!" he retorted. "If what is made with the breath of a mere mortal can be repaired, how much the more what is made with the breath of the Holy One, blessed be He!" R. Isaac said: It is not written, "*Thou shalt dash them in pieces like* earthen vessels," but, "*like a potter's vessels*", which means, those which have not yet been baked, so that they can be reformed (when broken)[13].

Here the parallelism almost amounts to identity, but for the use of fire. These texts are the more interesting because they date from the middle of the second century, the very same time in which the discussion about the resurrection was also going on in the Christian Church.

From this comparison we may, I think, conclude that in the discussions about the resurrection among Jews and Christians an argument against it was taken from the human body, his "vessel" was comparable to unrepairable earthenware, while on the other hand the fact that according to Gen. 2:7 God breathed in him made the comparison with a glass vessel near at hand. In the Gnostic text both elements are combined

and applied to two classes into which according to his conception mankind was divided, viz. the *choic* (earthly) and the pneumatic (spiritual), the former being unable, the latter being able to receive the resurrection.

In passing it may be remarked that the fact that man returned to dust did not prevent the Jews from believing in the resurrection, as appears from various sayings in T.B. *Sanhedrin* fols. 90*b*-91*a*. Tertullian speaks about man as earthenware "Because it was made of clay by means of the heat of the divine breathing"[14] and therefore the flesh is worthy to receive the resurrection.

If our reconstruction of the background of this Saying 51 is sound, it shows either that our Gnostic author knew about these Jewish discussions and applied them to his own needs, or that a very similar argumentation was current in Christian circles and that he used it to his own ends. We must leave this open. But the former possibility opens an interesting perspective on the relation between Judaism and Gnosticism, though it cannot go unnoticed that whereas it served with the Jews to prove the general resurrection, it was used by the Gnostic to make a distinction between those who will arise and those who remain dead.

III

In saying 53 it is said: "The eucharist (εὐχαριστία) is Jesus. For he is called in the Syrian Pharisatha, which is 'the spread out'. For Jesus came crucifying the world" (I follow here Dr Wilson's text, see op. cit. p. 113).

Here again we have a very curious explanation by means of the Syriac (see p. 113). It looks as though the author is particularly acquainted with that language and this knowledge enables him to give profound views, quite unexpected for the ordinary (Greek) reader.

In Syriac the word "Pharisatha" is actually found in the liturgical vocabulary as a designation of the eucharistic bread; it was a flat cake[15]. Now a difficulty here arises; most of our liturgical sources in Syriac, both Jacobite and Nestorian, are rather late (from the sixth century onward), most of them even very late. But from the fact that both churches use the word we may infer that the term was in use before the separation. It is already used in the Syriac translation of Acts 2:46: "and they brake the pharisatha in the houses".

Up till now I have found no parallels for the statement that Jesus = the Eucharist, but in view of texts like Ignatius *Ad Smyrn.* VII 1, "that the eucharist is the flesh of our Saviour Jesus Christ" and other texts where εὐχαριστία is used for the bread of the eucharist[16], the expression is intelligible.

Now it is a curious fact that in Acts 2:42 the Syriac translates "the breaking of the bread" by "the breaking of the eucharist" (the same expression is found in Acts 20:7, the Greek word being used in transcription; the Syriac translation is not consistent, however, because in Luke 24:30, Acts 20:11, 27:35 the ordinary word bread = *lachma* is used). As was remarked before in Acts 2:46 still another word occurs, namely, the breaking of the Pharisatha. Has this passage of Acts suggested to our author his idea or did it come from his liturgical vocabulary? A definite answer is impossible.

He was correct in stating that the verb from which the word was derived means "to extend, to stretch out"[17].

In early Christian literature the "stretching out" of the hands is often a sign of Jesus' cross; the history of Moses who extended his arms in the fight against Amalek (Exod. 17:8 ff.) is explained as a prediction of the cross in Barnabas 12:2-3[18]. That Jesus came crucifying the world is very likely a reminiscence of Paul's words in Gal. 6:14, Jesus Christ "by (*or* through) whom the world has been crucified".

In the eucharist the cross of Christ forms the centre, as is shown by means of the Syriac etymology. But the eucharist is not primarily thanksgiving for the work of creation and recreation; it is—typically Gnostic—an annihilation and renunciation of the world.

It must be assumed that the author of this saying stood not far apart from the church and its vocabulary, but he gave the words a typical twist.

These short notes do not lead to definite conclusions on the whole "Gospel of Philip". Their sole aim was to elucidate these particular words and to demonstrate that the expositor of this interesting book has to throw his net wide and in many directions, but that the haul may be rewarding.

NOTES

* Appeared in: *New Testament Studies* X (1964), p. 465-469.

[1] R. McL. Wilson, *The Gospel of Philip*, London 1962.

[2] H. M. Schenke, in: J. Leipoldt-H. M. Schenke, *Koptisch-gnostische Schriften aus den Papyrus-Codices von Nag-Hamadi*, Hamburg-Bergstedt 1960, p. 46; Wilson, op. cit. p. 109.

[3] That a difference between them was known, appears from the statements of Josephus, *Ant.* x 2:1 and xii 1:2.

[4] For the proper understanding we are compelled to add the English equivalent as well.

[5] In *Onomastica Sacra*, ed. P. de Lagarde (Göttingen), p. 66: *Messias unctus, id est Christus*. This text from Jerome is the only explanation in this book.

[6] H. M. Schenke, op. cit., p. 46, n. 2.

[7] J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, Berlin-Wien 1924, vol. iii, p. 270 *b* gives two meanings: (1) salben; (2) messen; pp. 272-273 s.v. *Mᵉsjiḥa*: (1) der

Gesalbte Hohepriester oder König: (2) der Messias, and then, as another item, the homonym: (1) das Salben; (2) Seil, Messchnur.—Also G. Dalman, *Aramäisch-Neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch*[2], Frankfurt-a.-Main 1922, p. 256.

[8] So, e.g. E. Preuschen, *Antilegomena*, Giessen 1901, p. 65; G. Ficker, 'Sprüche und Auslegungen der Presbyter des Irenäus', in: E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*[2], Tübingen 1924, pp. 540-51; there p. 544 (other literature on the Presbyters is mentioned by Ficker, p. 540 f.).

[9] This is, as Ficker remarked, a quotation from *Sap. Sal.* 2:20; see the commentary of A. T. S. Goodrick, *The Book of Wisdom*, London 1913, p. 251.

[10] Ficker, op. cit., p. 542, Nt. refers to a fragment of Melito in Syriac, where it is said: "the Illimitable is circumscribed" (twice), but I doubt whether this stems from the same root, since Melito uses this expression in one of these lists of contrast, of which he is so fond; it may also be that the Greek there would be ἀχώρητος.

[11] See on this point E. Peterson, *Frühkirche, Judentum und Gnosis*, Rom-Freiburg-Wien 1959, pp. 84-5 and M. Malinine, H. C. Puech, G. Quispel and W. Till, *De Resurrectione (Epistula ad Rheginum)*, Zürich-Stuttgart 1963, p. 20.

[12] A parallel text in slightly different wording is found in Midrash *Psalms* 2, § 11.

[13] So that the text could now be used as a proof for the resurrection.

[14] Tertullianus, *De Resurrectione Carnis*, VII 5.

[15] Cf. F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896, pp. 571-2, s.v. 'Bread'.

[16] *Did.* 9; Justinus Martyr, *Apol.* 66:1; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.* IV 18:5; Origenes, *Contra Cels.* VIII 57 ("the bread is called eucharistia").

[17] J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford 1903, p. 462.

[18] A sufficient, but not complete list of parallel texts, where the outstretching of the hands is mentioned, may be found in H. Windisch, *Der Barnabasbrief*, Tübingen 1920, p. 370.

THE NEWLY DISCOVERED GNOSTIC *EPISTLE TO RHEGINOS* ON THE RESURRECTION

I

It is my great privilege and pleasure to direct your attention to and to discuss with you in these lectures[1] a new, hitherto completely unknown Christian text, probably dating from the second century, Gnostic in origin and contents, dealing with the great and important doctrine of the Resurrection.

The choice of this subject was prompted by various reasons. The first reason lies in the fact that a new discovery hardly fails to attract attention and that it is a joy for a lecturer to guide his audience to an area which has only quite recently been disclosed. This general psychological factor is also at work in the field of early Christian studies. Everyone of you will be more or less familiar with the great and unexpected discovery made at Nag Hammadi (Upper Egypt) in 1945 by which an extensive library of Gnostic books, by far the greater part unknown, came into our hands. That mysterious phenomenon, called "Gnosis" or "Gnosticism", up till then known almost exclusively from the information furnished by its opponents or by rather late sources, has now come to light in works written by the Gnostics themselves. The first announcements of this discovery gave rise to great expectations. Various causes have contributed to the delay in the publication of these treasures, in particular the fact that these books are not preserved in the original Greek, but in Coptic translations and the extremely difficult character of their contents. But, thanks to various scholars in different countries the doors have been opened and gradually the texts of the *Apocryphon of John*, the *Gospel of Truth*, the *Gospel according to Thomas* and the *Gospel according to Philip* have become available. The year 1963 was particularly fruitful: Drs. Böhlig and Labib published two texts, Drs. Labib and Krause edited the *Apocryphon of John* in the three recensions that have come down to us in this library and Drs. Puech and Quispel, with the assistance of a group of other scholars, gave us another part of the Jung-Codex[2]. This last item we shall inspect somewhat more closely. But even from this short summary it becomes clear that there is no longer any cause for complaint and that there is a good deal of work to be done, because after the publication comes the interpretation and evaluation, and here we are still at the very beginning. In this way we shall get fresh insights into the true character and development of Gnosticism.

Secondly, this subject is of interest for the burning question of the relation between "Gnosis and New Testament". The older view about Gnosis regarded it as a Christian heresy, as was still held by such a great scholar as Burkitt[3]. This was in line with the conception of the Church Fathers. As a matter of fact, the Christian Church had to fight a great struggle with the Gnostic schools, such as those of Basilides and Valentinus in the second century and with western Manichaeism in the fourth century, both of which tried to give a reinterpretation of the Christian message. But a deeper insight into the religious world of the Roman imperial period, won by the great efforts of the "Religionsgeschichtliche Schule", by great scholars like Reitzenstein, Bousset and others, revealed that this "heretical" aspect was only one side of the picture, that Gnosticism was a religious movement which had a life of its own and that it existed also outside the precincts of the Church. What was its origin, where and when did it begin? For many scholars, especially in Germany, it is beyond any doubt that Gnosticism had a pre-Christian origin[4] and that many writers in the NT, mainly St. Paul and St. John, strongly reacted against it. It goes without saying that this conception largely affects the interpretation of the NT and may be regarded as one of the burning points at issue. Of course, this question cannot easily be decided and we must take into account that Gnosticism itself had a development of its own. Hence, in discussing the various documents we must try to define its exact relation to the NT.

A third reason which led us to our subject was the fact that the document we are dealing with dates from the second century. That period from the end of the apostolic age to, roughly speaking, the time of St. Irenaeus was extremely important for the history of Christianity. The young plant of the new faith was destined to flower in the hard outside world, spontaneously, but unprotected. Would its blossom be destroyed by the adverse winds, the heat of persecution, the coldness of unbelief? Would Christianity be changed in character when it sought to win the world for Christ and had to find its home there? This important age in which such great issues were at stake, is still unknown in many ways. Later ages which had to grapple with other questions were not interested in this early development. Much of it was forgotten. You will know that the important writings of the Apologists were preserved quite by chance because of the antiquarian interests of a bishop in the ninth century; it is only due to his alertness that we still possess Justin Martyr, Athenagoras and Tatian. Recently we have had complaints from two scholars[5] about this lack of sources for the second century. I would not go so far as they do. The magnificent work of previous generations in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries has unearthed much new material, the only difficulty

being that it is mostly anonymous and apocryphal, which makes precise dating almost impossible. Of course much is still missing—one has only to read a few pages in Eusebius's Church History to become aware of that—but a careful analysis of the material that is available and inferences that can be drawn from it bring a gradual and far from mean extension of our knowledge. When, as is the case with these Gnostic books, such documents from the second century come to light, they help us to gain a better understanding of that crucial period.

In the fourth place, I should like to underline the fact that the treatise under discussion deals with the resurrection. This doctrine was, as we shall see in our second lecture, of vital importance for the faith and life of the early Christians and was one of the main issues, almost an *articulus stantis aut cadentis ecclesiae*, in the second century. From the time that the article of the "resurrection of the flesh" or "of the body" became part of the Creeds there was not much discussion of it until the last three decades, during which its significance has been examined afresh. This happened in connexion with the question which Christianity confessed, which the Bible taught: immortality of the soul or resurrection. The former part of this alternative, so it was said by great theologians like Van der Leeuw, Cullmann and Menoud, was really an intrusion of Greek, pagan belief, though it was held by many Christians; it went together with an idealistic contempt for the body and divided the unity of man as a creation of God; the resurrection, on the contrary, was the true biblical doctrine, with its corollary in anthropology the unity of body and soul. With regard to this controversy we may content ourselves by referring to the careful doctoral dissertation of my fellow-countryman Dr. P. J. van Leeuwen, *The Christian Belief in Immortality*[6]. For the moment it will be sufficient to have shown that this treatise is devoted to a theme which has been and still is very important from the dogmatic point of view.

Let us now, after these introductory remarks, turn to the book itself. It was published as an *edition de luxe* in the same form as the *Evangelium Veritatis* of 1956; it contains a photographic reproduction of the manuscript and an edition of the Coptic text with three translations in French, German and English, together with a very thorough introduction and full explanatory notes in French; an edition which fulfils the highest requirements as one may expect from such expert scholars as Puech, Quispel and Till. Apart from the materials provided in this *editio princeps*, I have seen so far only one article dealing with this book; it is written in Dutch by Dr. Zandee; the author discusses the relations between this discourse and the Gospel of Philip and shows some striking similarities in some of their leading ideas[7].

So there is some "playing-ground" left for us. What I propose to do is to devote this first lecture to an analytical investigation of the work itself; tomorrow's lecture will try to place it in its contemporary setting and to define its relation to the conception of the resurrection in other writings.

As in many other cases the title of this book stands at the end: "The treatise concerning the Resurrection". It is not an extensive discourse, since it runs to only seven pages. The author does not disclose his name and although the name of the addressee is mentioned, namely "Rheginos", that does not help us any further, because he too is unknown. The only thing that can be said is that the writer calls this Rheginos his "son" (47) which is certainly an indication that a teacher is writing to his disciple (see below p. 248). There is no external evidence to enable us to settle the questions of date and authorship. The book is not mentioned nor quoted by any other writer, at least according to the present state of our knowledge. The internal evidence does not offer any clue either, because there are no references to certain facts which can fix the *terminus a quo* and *ad quem* within any strict limits. Of course the writer lived after St. Paul, whose authority is acknowledged (45); so one can be practically sure that he lived in the second century, the very age in which the question concerning the resurrection was a burning one (see part II). But at what point within the second century the book was written, and where within the great Roman empire, remains uncertain. With more confidence are we able to speak about the spiritual home of its author. The editors have made it perfectly clear, by a wealth of illustrative material, that this little book is a product of the Valentinian school, and they have not even excluded the possibility that the Master was Valentinus himself[8], though that remains uncertain, since the author did not reveal his identity. Since Puech and Quispel have so brilliantly shown the Gnostic character of this treatise and with many parallels established the links between this and other products of Gnostic schools, there is no need for me to elaborate on this point.

When we compare this treatise *On the Resurrection* with many other products of Gnostic thought, it may be said that this writing is rather sober and fairly clear in its sequence of thought. A short survey may be helpful. The author starts with stating that he, in contrast with many others who make inquiries, takes his stand on the word of the Lord Christ. The resurrection is necessary, but is not believed by many. Jesus, as being Son of God and Son of Man in one, vanquished death and restored mankind into the Pleroma, because he was from above. He gave us the way of our immortality, for according to the word of the apostle Paul we share in his suffering, resurrection and ascension. After death we are drawn upward like beams by the sun. "This is the spiritual resurrec-

tion which swallows up the psychic alike with the fleshly'' (45-46). This is a matter of faith, not of philosophic persuasion. ''For we came to know the Son of Man, and we came to believe that he rose again from the dead, and this is he of whom we say that he became the destruction of death'' (46). Those who believe are immortal and elect unto salvation, for they are destined not to fall into the folly of those who are ignorant. Rheginos should not have his doubts with regard to the resurrection, for as Christ took on flesh in coming into this world, he will do the same in going up to the aeon. ''That which is better than the flesh is for it the cause of life'' (47). Rheginos wants to know what he lacks. The after-birth of the body is old age, and man is corruption. Hence absence is an advantage. But he can be sure of salvation. Some people raise questions as to whether the redeemed after death will be further saved. There is no reason for doubt: not the visible yet dead members, but the living members are saved. ''What is the resurrection? It is the revelation at every moment of those who have arisen'' (48). The author refers to the story of the Transfiguration in the Gospel, which proves that the resurrection is not an illusion, but rather is of this world, because death changes everything. The resurrection, however, ''is the revelation of that which is and the transformation of things, and a transition into a new existence'' (48). Since incorruptibility descends upon corruption Rheginos must cease to think in parts and he will partake of the resurrection, which is for the believer as sure as death for ordinary man; he must exercise himself and free himself from this element, to receive himself again as he was at first. This teaching the author has received from his Lord Jesus Christ and he passes it on without leaving out anything. If need be, he will give further explanation. Rheginos must also instruct others, because it may be of help. The treatise ends with greetings.

The discussion of some important aspects of this interesting document may start with the question of the literary *genre*. Although some circles attach too much weight, in my opinion, to the literary form and although I cannot consider the outward form all-decisive for its contents, it is an important factor. It helps us to discover the perspective in which a particular writing must be viewed and can throw some light on the intentions of the author and on the ''Sitz im Leben''.

Our writing is called in the subscript-title a ''λόγος concerning the resurrection''. In this connexion λόγος has the meaning of ''discourse''[9]. But it is not a treatise written because the author felt an inward impulse to do so. It professes to be an answer to a question put to him by his son Rheginos. The relation ''Father-Son'' does not need to be and is not even very likely to be one of natural kinship, but points to spiritual filiation, which is very frequent in Hellenistic times[10]. This discourse takes

the form of a letter, especially at the end, although the prescript of the epistle is missing, a fact somewhat similar to the situation in the Epistle "to the Hebrews". The present discourse is an example of the well-known *genre* of philosophical and ethical treatises in epistolary form and many passages remind us of the "diatribe", as we find it, e.g., in Seneca and Epictetus.

But that is only one side of the picture. In the opening paragraph the author speaks of people who "are involved in questions (ζήτημα) which lack their solution" and are boasting if they are successful. What has he in mind? This is quite clear. In Hellenistic and imperial times there existed a kind of literature of "questions and answers" which was also taken over by the Christians[11]. It came into existence among the students of Homer's poems, in which certain difficult words or expressions called for explanation[12], but later this method was extended to other poets and subjects. Often these questions were rather trivial or ridiculous, but the grammarians treated them quite seriously; they wanted to make a great impression on the public, but became the laughing-stock of serious men like Aulus Gellius and Plutarch[13], who, not unlike our author, rejected their methods.

However, the son Rheginos has raised a question, not on a point of grammar or language, but on the resurrection (44). The author tries to persuade his pupil not to be doubtful with regard to the resurrection. But not only uncertainty on this vital point calls for an answer; the writer also knows of certain people 'who raise questions about their problem, whether the redeemed, if he leave behind his body will forthwith be saved' (47). This shows that not general questions, but very specific ones were at stake. The author does not give his answer in the formal way—first the difficulty, followed by the solution—no, he deals with the problem which vexes Rheginos in the form of a philosophical treatise.

Without anticipating too much of our second lecture we may remark here that Tertullian speaks about "the heat of questionings" about the resurrection[14]. A remarkable parallelism may be found in the opening chapter of Athenagoras, *On the Resurrection of the Flesh*: "For in regard to this subject also we find some utterly disbelieving, and some others doubting, and even among those who have accepted the first principles some who are as much at a loss what to believe as those who doubt" (ch. 1).

But the questions discussed by the Apologist are different from those dealt with by our teacher. Yet he does not invent something, but reflects real debates. This may be gathered from remarks like that of Justin, who speaks about people who profess to be Christians, "who say that there is no resurrection of the dead, but that at the moment of death their souls

are taken up into heaven'' (*Dial.*, LXXX). A similar attack is launched by Irenaeus against the Gnostics[15].

This material may be sufficient to show that the author took up real questions. The remarkable thing about his answer—and this also belongs to the form of this treatise—is that this book does not in any way take the form of a mystery-book or a secret revelation. Father Festugière, in his great book *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*[16], has produced a wealth of material showing the manifold forms in which this kind of revelation manifested itself, but our treatise does not belong to this class. Neither is it a preliminary discussion, preceding the Gnostic revelation proper as, e.g., the *Epistle to Flora*. It is a clear-cut exposition of the theme which he will expand if need be and which the recipient must promulgate because it may be helpful to others.

The author did not follow a set pattern, but wrote in the style of an educated man on some questions which had arisen in the mind of his pupil concerning this vital topic.

This leads us to a second observation. The author, although he clearly possessed education and skill as a writer, did not want to treat his subject as a philosopher. In a rather obscure passage[17] he distinguishes himself and his method from the philosophers of this world. It is impossible, he says, to persuade an unbeliever (46). And, if we compare this treatise with other texts in the Christian literature of the second century, it is striking that he does not use proofs from nature, like the rising of the sun, as did 1 Clement, Theophilus and others[18], or refer to the omnipotence of God. This fact cannot simply be explained by referring to the Gnosticism of the writer, which rejected the creation. It has a far more positive motivation. Time and again he stresses ''faith'': ''For it is the place of faith, my son, and does not belong to persuasion'' (46). This faith is not a general belief or hope, but it is the Christian faith. This central confession may be quoted in full: ''For we came to know the Son of Man, and we came to believe that he rose again from the dead, and this is he of whom we say that he became the destruction of death, so that it is a great one on whom they believe'' (46). In contrast with the people who revel in questions and answers he says: ''I do not think that they took their stand within the word of the truth, since they seek rather their rest—which we have received through our Saviour, our Lord Christ'' (43).

This emphasis on faith (πίστις) is remarkable, because it is generally held that in Gnosticism ''faith'' is only the first stage, good enough for the simple ''believers'', while ''Gnosis'' (Knowledge) is the degree of perfection which is only reached by the Gnostics, who are far superior to the ''believers''[19]. But here there is no such distinction: the writer takes his own firm stand in ''faith'' and ''faith alone''. The resurrection is not a superfluity, but a necessary part of Christian teaching (44).

In reading this discourse we are struck by the unswerving firmness of his conviction. The great historian of the early Church, Adolf von Harnack, says in his classic *History of Christian Doctrine*, in speaking of Gnostic eschatology, that the expectations of the future seem to have been for most Gnostics very vague and without importance, and he remarks that they shared the same uncertainty and religious dejection as the Greek philosophers[20]. This was said, of course, before our treatise became known; it may hold good for many Gnostics, though we are not too well informed on this point, but in the light of the present work any such saying must be completely reviewed. Here a strong conviction is voiced and it draws its strength not from a vague religious philosophy, but from a firm belief in Jesus Christ the risen Lord.

Here we come to the third point I want to discuss, namely, the role of Jesus Christ. This is absolutely central. The author professes to have received his teaching "from the liberality of my Lord Jesus Christ" (49-50). It is that which he passes on. This conception of Jesus as teacher of special revelations is not unique; on the contrary one may say that this teaching-office of Jesus is the predominant, almost sole feature of Jesus's work, according to the Gnostics[21]. But there are two remarkable facts here: (a) this teaching about the resurrection is very distinct in character from the revelations he gives in other Gnostic documents; it is not an addition, sometimes very considerable, often amounting to something completely new, to the teaching of the apostles, but it is a certain conception of a doctrine, generally held in the Church; (b) the work of Jesus is not limited to his teaching. We must put it this way: that the author is able to pass on this teaching about the resurrection, is the result of Jesus's own resurrection, "which came into being through our Lord the Saviour Jesus Christ" (48).

It is noteworthy to observe that Jesus is not only called *Soter* = "Saviour" here, but also "Lord", cf. the same combination (43) "our Saviour, our Lord Jesus Christ", this latter epithet being interpreted as "the Good One" (*Chrestos*), in accordance with a usage current in the second century[22]. The remarkable thing is that the author reproduces the well-known Christian terminology while Irenaeus makes the explicit statement about the Valentinians that they prefer the names of "Saviour" and "Christ", but "do not please to call Him 'Lord' "[23]. This Jesus "was in the flesh" (44), we are told in passing—a statement which shows that the author did not hold a docetic Christology. But even more striking is the fact that he uses the scheme: Son of God—Son of Man to express the two complementary sides of Jesus's unique personality, one expressing his Godhead, the other his Manhood: "the Son of God, Rheginos, was also Son of Man, and he encompassed them both,

since he possessed the manhood and the deity" (44). It should be remarked that the term "Son of Man" does not denote the apocalyptic figure of Daniel and the Gospels, nor the Gnostic notion of "Son of God Anthropos", as found in Irenaeus[24], but indicates Jesus's humanity. This is in line with the interpretation of this dark expression in the Christian Church since the second century. The combination "Son of God" and "Son of Man" for Jesus was current in the theological vocabulary of the Christians, as appears from an almost credal declaration like that of Ignatius, *Eph.*, 20:2: "Jesus Christ, who in the flesh was of the line of David, the Son of Man and the Son of God" and Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, III 16:3:5: "the Son of God became Son of Man"[25]. But behind this Christology, which is in conformity with that of the 'great Church', stands a Gnostic conception: He is "a seed of the truth, when this structure had not yet come into being". Although this Gnostic element is not fully developed here, it is sufficiently clear, both from the parallels brought together by Puech and Quispel, and from the whole setting in which this Christology is placed in connexion with the resurrection.

What did this "Son of God"—"Son of Man" do? The passage is very explicit: "he possessed the manhood and the deity, in order that on the one hand he might vanquish death through his being the Son of God, and that on the other hand through the Son of Man the restoration (ἀποκατάστασις) into the Pleroma might take place" (44). This statement that Christ triumphed over death is several times repeated: "the Saviour swallowed up death" (45); "he rose again from the dead, and this is he of whom we say that he became the destruction of death" (46). Here the author reflects what was generally held in the Church, for this motive of the "Christus Victor" is found in the NT and in writers of the second century like Barnabas and Justin Martyr[26]. The other line leads to the Gnostic view: a part of the Pleroma has detached itself from it and become the cosmos, as is said (46). It must be restored and this is done by Jesus: "he changed himself into an incorruptible aeon and raised himself up, after he had swallowed up the visible by the invisible" (45).

This resurrection of Jesus is the basis and guarantee of the resurrection of his believers; for "he gave us the way of our immortality" (45); "those who believe are immortal" (46). How does this happen? Our author quotes a saying of the Apostle: "we suffered with him, and we rose with him, and we went to heaven with him". Through this union with Jesus Christ, the conqueror, it comes about. Here we hear echos of the words of St. Paul and we are reminded of the fact that the resurrection of Christ was generally considered to be the example and guarantee of the resurrection of his followers[27]. But the strong emphasis on faith gets a Gnostic turn when it is said: "it is appointed for us from the beginning that we

should not fall into the folly of those who are ignorant, but we shall enter into the wisdom of those who have known the truth''. In this setting the NT ideas of ''redemption'' and ''election'' are placed (46). They get an ontological, metaphysical twist, because they are taken out from their historical context.

What is the resurrection? A clear answer to this question is given (48): ''It is the revelation at every moment of those who have arisen'' and a demonstration of this truth is found in the story of the Transfiguration, where Elijah and Moses appear. This redemption is already in the possession of the believers, because of their union with Christ. Jesus ''laid aside the world, which perisheth'' (45); if the believers discover the illusory character of this world (48), if they ''come away from the division and bonds'', they have the resurrection (49). It works a complete change, ''for incorruptibility descends upon the corruption, and the light flows down upon the darkness to swallow it up, and the Pleroma makes perfect the deficiency'' (48-49). Men become part of the All and are saved: ''we arose with him''.

The believers while in this world are wearing him and are his beams. Very aptly the editors of this treatise have brought this idea into relation with the solar theology which prevailed in many quarters[28]. Man is a beam of the sun and at the moment of physical death he is ''drawn upward like the beams by the sun, without being held back by anything'' (45). Life on earth is compared with the period of being in the womb and old age is the afterbirth[29]. Then comes the moment of the complete resurrection: ''this is the spiritual resurrection which swallows up the psychic alike with the fleshly'' (45-46).

There is no reason for doubts. The resurrection of Jesus Christ has taken place and gives us the resurrection. The story of the Transfiguration shows in the persons of Elijah and Moses that the resurrection is not an illusion. And a further argument for the resurrection is found in the sphere of anthropology: as men, being born into this world, took on flesh[30], so he will take it on when going up into the aeon (see 47). The use of this argument shows that the author is speaking about the resurrection in the sense of ''the resurrection of the flesh''.

Having argued in order to dispel all doubts about this Christian teaching, the author calls his ''son'' to throw away all ''thinking in part'' or ''divisions'' and also conduct according to the flesh (49). He must exercise himself, because he has received the resurrection. This will prevent him from going astray and help him to ''receive himself as he was at first''. Death will certainly come, but he may consider himself as already risen[31].

In reviewing the line of our author we observe that he decidedly takes his stand within the Christian Church and its teaching on the resurrection: he quotes the Gospel and St. Paul; his ideas have parallels in non-Gnostic authors and are based solely on the work of Jesus Christ. He teaches the resurrection and not something like reincarnation, as did some ancient philosophers. This last point may be underlined, since a Greek opponent to Christianity like Celsus maintained that the Christians misunderstood the philosophers[32].

A second striking feature of this discourse is its positive character. There is a marked contrast with what is usually said about the Gnostic attitude towards the resurrection, viz. that they rejected it because "the flesh was incapable of receiving it", according to 1 Corinthians 15:50: "flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God". Here is no criticism or rejection of the flesh, but it, too, is taken up in the total resurrection. The resurrection is not purely spiritual, but comprises spirit, soul and flesh. The soul is not imprisoned in the body, as was held by many non-Christian thinkers. The fetters which are spoken of are the fact that one lives in this world.

Thirdly, we may remark, the author does not seem to have divided mankind into certain classes of "pneumatics", "psychics" and "hylics", of whom the first group may be certain of the resurrection, the second may strive for it, while the third can be sure of its condemnation. The only distinction here is that between believers and non-believers. It seems as though the soul of man in itself is not immortal; he only receives immortality by believing, coming into union with Jesus Christ. Before that moment man can be sure of death and destruction, for that is the law of nature (44), but through the risen Lord there has come a change. Man is not, as such, a beam of the sun, but becomes it by faith in Christ.

Fourthly, we observe, the author clearly belongs to that class of Christians which Justin and Irenaeus had in mind, when they said that they professed the name of Christ but believed that man went up to heaven immediately after death. The idea of a "judgment", which in the Church's teaching was so closely connected with the resurrection, is completely missing here. Resurrection is not a future event at the end of time, but takes place whenever a man comes to faith. It may be that behind this conception stands the Pauline view of baptism as a dying and rising with Christ (Rom. 6), but, if so, it is not clearly expressed; there are no references to baptism. One may, however, also recall passages like Col. 2:12 f.: "baptism in which you were also raised with him through faith in the working of God, who raised him from the dead. And you, who were dead in trespasses and the uncircumcision of your flesh, God made alive together with him"; ibid., 3:20: "If with Christ you died to the elemental

spirits of the universe, why do you live as if you still belonged to the world?'' and similar texts in other epistles. But there is no place here for what Paul expressed in 2 Cor. 5:10: ''We must all appear before the judgment seat of Christ, so that each one may receive good or evil, according to what he has done in the body''.

It is also interesting to make a comparison between this writing and the view expressed in 1 John 3:14: ''we know that we have passed out of death into life, because we love the brethren''. On both sides faith has brought new life, but in 1 John this finds expression in love towards the brethren; in this Epistle it leads to a kind of ascetism for the individual.

This treatise tries to dispel the doubts concerning the Christian doctrine of the resurrection. In various places it uses phrases which we find in the New Testament and the second-century Christian writings. Nevertheless, the context in which this doctrine functions is different from that of the New Testament and non-Gnostic books: it is purely vertical instead of vertical and horizontal; it is, one may say, cosmological instead of theological. The misfortune which must be repaired is that the world with its divisions and elements separated itself from the Pleroma (unfortunately we are not told how this happened) and this unhappy state has been repaired by the resurrection of Jesus Christ, which enables those who believe in him to rise. But this evil is not ''sin''—as a transgression against the will of God—and the resurrection is not the inauguration of a new creation.

In the preceding paragraphs I have already made some comparisons with contemporary ideas to give the portrait of our author a somewhat sharper profile. In our second lecture tomorrow we will try to define the place of this writing within the theological currents of its time somewhat more precisely, but I hope to have made clear what the author's line of argument was and what sort of interpretation he gave to this central Christian doctrine.

II

It is always somewhat precarious to speak about a Gnostic book and to assess its importance. Experience shows that some people, attracted by the very fact that a completely unknown book has been discovered, are more or less disappointed when they make their first acquaintance with one of these ''Gospels from the Nile-sand''[33]. Now this is a fairly general reaction; places marked in travel-guides with three stars very seldom meet with general approval except for snobs. I for one must always suppress a feeling of disappointment on entering a site of archaeological excavation of which I read glowing descriptions. But in the case of these

Gnostic writings there is more that can explain the feeling I have mentioned.

Gnostic authors did not excel in logical thinking; their speculations are often very unfamiliar to us and are expressed in a language intelligible only to the initiated. The subjects of their reflexions look abstruse at first sight; they are at least very abstract, because the Gnostic—one might say, by definition—was not interested in this world and its history, in its inhabitants as individuals and their present lives. So these writings miss historical concreteness and conjure up spirits which are completely alien to us.

That may all be true, but only to a certain extent. All real study of mankind's past and present requires from us the willingness to learn another language, the readiness to listen. And, as far as the Gnostics are concerned, we cannot overlook the fact that their teachings had such an attraction for many Christians in the crucial period of the Church's existence that they were considered as the great threat. Although their literary output offers little historical evidence to go by, it came into being within a certain historical situation and we must try to bring this to light.

In the present case of the *Epistle to Rheginos on the Resurrection* we are rather fortunate. The author, as we saw in the first lecture, did not handle a subject that stood far apart from what moved the hearts and minds of his fellow-Christians; he did not deal with specific Gnostic revelations, but offered a particular interpretation of a well-known Christian theme. This is precisely the interesting aspect of this writing, that it treats a subject which in one way or another also attracted the attention of other Christian writers, and this is the only Gnostic discussion of this theme that has so far survived.

It was not a mean or subordinate subject on which the anonymous teacher enlightened his pupil Rheginos. On the contrary, it was most vital for the Christians and stood at the storm centre in the second century.

Before discussing with you the importance of this topic I want to stress that we are not dealing with eschatology in general nor with the question of the immortality of the soul and its fate after death, but with a specific article of the faith: the resurrection of the dead or of the flesh, the raising of the dead at the end of time. In some cases this is linked up with and discussed in relation to the immortality of the soul, but in itself these two conceptions are quite distinct and are not bound together like Siamese twins.

The resurrection of the dead: how much it was the heart-beat of the early Christians is shown by the opening phrases of Tertullian's book on this subject, written about 210[34]: "The resurrection of the dead is Chris-

tian men's confidence. By believing it we are what we claim to be. This belief the truth exacts: the truth is what God reveals''[35]. Minucius Felix declares that ''for our consolation all nature suggests a future resurrection''[36]. In the *Acts of Paul and Thecla* the Apostle's teaching is summarised under the heading ''the word of God on resurrection and continence'', which is followed by a number of special beatitudes[37]. In this book, which is typical of the faith of the average Christian at the end of the second century, it becomes apparent what deep an impact this belief had on the Christian life: the resurrection was not only a prospect for the future, promising eternal blessedness for the faithful, but also required a certain mode of life now, because St. Paul is said to have taught: ''Ye have no resurrection otherwise, except ye continue chaste and defile not the body, but keep it pure''[38]. In the heat of persecution the martyrs drew hope and strength from this certitude, as we hear in the prayer of Polycarp: ''I bless Thee, because Thou hast seen fit to bestow upon me this day and this hour, that I may share, among the number of the martyrs, the cup of thy Anointed and rise to eternal life both in soul and in body, in virtue of the immortality of the Holy Spirit''[39]. The great comfort this faith gave to the martyrs was even known to the non-Christians, according to the famous report of the persecution in Lyons and Vienne: the bones of the Christians were burnt and their ashes thrown in the river ''in order ... that they may not have hope in a resurrection, trusting to which they introduce some strange and new mode of worship, and despise dangers and go readily and with joy to death''[40].

This belief in the resurrection of the flesh is, according to one writer, the really new thing Christ has given to the world: ''If then the Saviour ... proclaimed salvation to the soul alone, what new thing, beyond what we heard of Pythagoras and Plato and all their band, did He bring us? But now He has come proclaiming the glad tidings of a new and strange hope to men. For indeed it was a strange and new thing for God to promise that He would not keep incorruption in corruption, but would make corruption incorruption''[41].

Many writers, we are told by Athenagoras in his treatise *On the Resurrection*, have written on the subject[42]. How far this was an exaggeration we cannot tell. At any rate, not much of it has survived except the special treatises of Athenagoras, Tertullian and the fragments ascribed to Justin Martyr. But in other writers of the second century the motif is found again and again. It is met in various contexts. The writers who voiced the point of view of the main stream in Christendom ''saw that man considered in himself was inseparably flesh and spirit. In the creation of man, in the ethical behaviour of man, in the judgment of man, in the present salvation of man, the flesh was inseparably involved with his

spirit. This, they held, would be no different in the resurrection''[43]. The coming resurrection and future judgment gave a special force and earnestness to the Christian preaching. This prospect of the triumph of God's righteousness emphasised man's responsibility and filled their hearts with hope, because through their faith in Jesus Christ they were certain of their participation in God's Kingdom.

From the very beginning of the Church this doctrine of the resurrection was part and parcel of its teaching. Against the mocking criticism of the Sadducees, Jesus, basing himself on the OT, had proclaimed it[44]. And, for the apostolic Church, Jesus's resurrection was the warrant that He would be ''the first born of the dead''[45]. In all the books of the NT it is expressly said or presupposed that the dead shall be raised. But, although this was generally held, we hear that in Corinth 'some' members of the Church denied it[46], which led St. Paul to his famous and long exposition in 1 Cor. 15. In the story of Paul's preaching in Athens, according to the report of Luke, the fact that the resurrection of the dead is mentioned, causes a break in the attention of his philosophic audience and ''some mocked''[47]. But, on the whole, this belief does not seem to have been a storm-centre of attack and defence in the first century.

Yet here, according to Tertullian, is the line dividing the Christian from the non-Christians: ''one cannot be a Christian who denies that resurrection which Christians confess''[48].

In the second century the picture has changed. The manner in which this subject is brought up in various circles shows that it has become highly controversial. It would not be unfair to say that at no time in the long history of Christianity the resurrection of the dead has been so much debated as during that period. In the third century the front had shifted. It had become a fixed element in the Creed: ''I believe the resurrection of the flesh'' or ''of the body'' and, when Origen's views on the matter were criticised by Methodius[49], the controversy was fought over different points from those in the period that interests us in this lecture.

Tertullian speaks about ''the struggling faith of the resurrection of the flesh''[50]. It was, according to Origen[51], a very difficult subject which was often misunderstood, especially by the representation of ''simple Christians''. What were the points of controversy and dispute? For our present purpose it is more important to detect these than to follow the often long-winded arguments of the church writers in defence of the doctrine[52], because that would lead us too far afield in the regions of anthropology.

The battle had to be fought on various fronts, against foes without and within the Church, viz. against criticism of the pagans, against doubts among church-members, against the opposing tenets of Gnosticism.

(*a*). Since the doctrine of the resurrection was, as we heard from (Pseudo) Justin, the new and unheard-of teaching of the Saviour, it is not surprising that we find pagans criticising it. Tertullian speaks about the mockery of the multitude and of philosophers who followed suit[53]. As so often, we find a very good summary of these objections in Celsus's great attack on Christianity[54]. He calls it the hope of worms; for what sort of human soul would have any further desire for a body that had rotted? "The idea of resurrection is both revolting and impossible"; he knows that the Christians answer that anything is possible to God[55], which he calls a most outrageous refuge; "neither can God do what is shameful nor does He desire what is contrary to nature". Celsus accepts an everlasting life for the soul, but as to the body he quotes with approval Heraclitus, that corpses are worse than dung; "as for the flesh, which is full of things which it is not even nice to mention, God would neither desire nor be able to make it everlasting contrary to reason". Here we find clearly formulated the main objections or the vital differences: the conception of God and the rejection of the corruptible body; the immortality of the soul could be acceptable, since it has affinity to God, but not the raising of the body.

But there were also other objections. Theophilus had to do with an unbeliever who wanted to see a dead man raised[56]. Here was unbelief *tout court*. The reference to examples of a return to life in Greek mythology, which Theophilus gives, could hardly be successful, because one could say with the pagan critic of Minucius Felix: "all such figments ... with which deceiving poets have trifled"[57]. Also a direct attack was made by showing its impossibility by a logical reasoning taken from life. This was most clearly stated by Athenagoras: "many bodies of those who have come to an unhappy death in shipwrecks and rivers have become food for fishes"; they have become distributed over many animals, and these animals in their turn have been eaten, so "either the bodies of the former possessors cannot be reconstituted, the parts which composed them having passed into others, or that, these having been restored to the former, the bodies of the last possessors will come short"[58].

(*b*). In his assault on the Christian position Celsus knew that he had supporters of his views within the Church, for he says: "The fact that this doctrine is not shared ... by some Christians shows its utter repulsiveness"[59]. He does not elaborate this argument, so it may be that here, as elsewhere[60], he has the Gnostics in mind, who in his time were still within the Church. The same will be true of the people mentioned by Justin Martyr: "who are called Christians ... venture to blaspheme the God of Abraham, and the God of Isaac, and the God of Jacob; who say there is no resurrection of the dead, and that their souls, when they die,

are taken to heaven''[61]. But Tertullian, in his attack upon these Gnostics, tells us that besides them ''there are many unlearned and a number doubtful of their own faith, and not a few plain men, who will need to be equipped, guided and protected''[62]. This situation is very typically reflected in that curious document, the *Epistle of the Apostles* (*c.* 160 according to C. Schmidt). In the community from which it took its origin, the Creed had only five articles; the five loaves of the miraculous Feeding (Mt. 14:17 ff.) are explained as ''the Symbol of our faith'' in the Father, the Son, the Holy Ghost, the Church and the remission of sins. So an article on the resurrection is missing, and the *Epistle* itself shows that this is not by mere chance. The topic was highly controversial. It is strongly stressed that the apostles did not believe the resurrection of Jesus at first, and the reality of His resurrection is shown in a very extensive way[63]. Afterwards, when Jesus has declared Himself to be ''the resurrection of the dead'', they ask: ''Lord, is it true that the flesh shall be judged together with the soul and the spirit?'' They are rebuked for that question: ''How long will you inquire and doubt?'' ''Verily I say unto you, the resurrection of the flesh shall come to pass with the soul therein and the spirit.'' But the apostles say: ''Lord, is it then possible that that which is dissolved and brought to nought should become whole? And we ask thee not as unbelieving, neither as if it were impossible unto thee'', to which Jesus in wrath answers: ''O ye of little faith, how long will ye ask questions?'' In the next chapter it is stated again ''that which hath fallen shall rise again ... that in these things that are so created the glory of my Father may be revealed''[64]. The remarkable fact that here the doubts are voiced by the apostles themselves makes this piece of evidence particularly interesting.

But here also these doubts are silenced by the restatement of the Christian faith by Him who has the highest authority. Yet the arguments of the opponents or doubters are not met in one way or another—and that was necessary since the arguments of the heathen had won adherence within the Church among them that were called ''heretics''.

(*c*). For the sake of clearness we treat this group separately, but we must make a restriction from the outset: the borderlines are not always very well-marked. As we shall see, many people who were accused of holding differing views about the resurrection still belonged to the Church in the second century. The problem of ''church and gnosis'' cannot simply be defined as one of opposing rival groups, as was the case at a later date and as it was in the eyes of the church writers. It was far more complicated and one of our future tasks in studying the doctrinal development of that age will be to draw the picture of and to clarify this complexity.

The denial of the resurrection is one of the tenets strongly combatted by Polycarp: "whoever wrests the Lord's Gospel to suit his own lusts and denies both resurrection and judgment—such a one is the first-born of Satan"[65]. According to a dating that is accepted by many nowadays this was written about AD 135 and directed against Marcion. This is possible[66], but not certain. In the apocryphal correspondence of Paul with the Corinthians, which we now possess in its Greek form and which probably dates from the sixties, we read that certain men, Simon and Cleobius, have come to the Corinthians "overthrowing the faith of many with teachings one had not heard from the apostles". They say that we "must not use the prophets and that God is not Almighty, and that there shall not be a resurrection of the flesh, and that man was not made by God, and that Christ came not down in the flesh, neither was born of Mary, and that the world is not of God, but of the angels"[67]. The long refutation of this rejection of the resurrection[68] shows how vital this was at the time, though we must accept with Dr. Klijn in his careful analysis[69] that it is impossible to say "that the correspondence was written against one particular kind of heresy. The correspondence probably described a tendency in the early Church". In the third-century *Didascalia Apostolorum* this feature is one of the three (rejection of the OT; of the omnipotence of God and of the resurrection)[70], which characterize the false prophets who arose after the apostles; and this type of heresy is distinguished from ascetic tendencies mentioned afterwards. This is a more or less stereotyped description, though the long repetition and restating of the doctrine in ch. 20 shows that this rejection of the resurrection still exercised some influence. These teachings are ascribed to Simon Magus and a certain Cleobius and seem to be interrelated: because they rejected the OT and the creative activity of God they also denied the resurrection.

In the treatise *On the Resurrection* ascribed to Justin Martyr, we read that the devil tried to "seduce the faithful from their faith and ... prevent the faithless from believing". He describes those "who maintain the wrong opinion in saying that there is no resurrection of the flesh", because "it is impossible that what is corrupted and dissolved should be restored to the same as it had been"; also, that it is disadvantageous, because the flesh is the cause of sin and if it arises it must be either perfect, i.e. also with the genitalia which is absurd and against our Lord's saying in Mark 12:25, or imperfect which is against God's omnipotence. Some even maintain that Jesus's resurrection was only spiritual and not in the flesh[71]. It was in order to protect "the weak", on whom these arguments might make some impression, that the author wrote.

Here we see that the denial of the resurrection was mainly due to a rejection of the concrete form of human existence on earth, the flesh. In the summary of heretical teachings of Pseudo-Tertullian this fact returns at every step—no resurrection of the body (Basilides, Ophites, Carpocrates, Valentinus, Marcus, Cerdo, Apelles), with as a corollary "salvation for the soul" and a docetic Christology[72].

The main point here is always that the flesh is not capable of receiving incorruptibility[73]. With this point Tertullian's great refutation is mainly concerned, because his adversaries "acknowledge half a resurrection, that is of the soul alone, spurning the flesh as they also spurn even the Lord of the flesh"[74]. He summarizes their objections by quoting them as saying: "Do you then, as a philosopher, wish to persuade us that this flesh, when it has been ravished from your sight and touch and remembrance—that it is sometime to recover itself to wholeness out of corruption ... that even the funeral pyre or the sea or the bellies of wild beasts ... will give it back again? will the maimed return in the same bodies? will the bodies regain their ordinary work and even their shameful parts?"[75] Tertullian repeats here arguments also found in Athenagoras and Justin, *De Resurrectione*. They were produced by those heretics who repeated what the pagan critics said, as Tertullian aptly remarked: "Is there anything a heretic says which a gentile has not already said?" But the heretics also strengthened their position by an appeal to St. Paul's words, that "flesh and blood will not inherit the kingdom of God" (1 Cor. 15:49).

Still another view of the resurrection must be mentioned. So far we have met with denial of the future resurrection as held by the Church. But there was also a conception current that the resurrection had already taken place. This is found already in 2 Timothy 2:18 as the opinion of some teachers, Hymenaeus and Philetus, unknown to us, "who swerved from the truth by holding that the resurrection is passed already". The interpretation of this text is very obscure, because we are not told what reasons for this teaching were given. Had the writer of the Pastoral Epistles one heresy in mind or did he warn against a variety of groups[76]? Were they Gnostic or not? In the present stage of our knowledge we have no means of settling these questions. However, in the second century we meet with the same contention. According to Clement of Alexandria, the Encratites said that they had already received the resurrection[77], and one may ask whether there is a connection here with 1 Tim. 4. In that case it may be supposed that for them the resurrection took place at baptism; the present ascetic state of life was not a preparation for, a preservation of a pure body for the coming judgment, but a life along the new lines of the heavenly world. It may be so, although it cannot be left unnoticed that according to Epiphanius[78] the Encratites believed in a future resurrec-

tion. In the course of time a change of opinion may have taken place; or different statements on this particular point may have come from different groups[79]. Asceticism may have various roots.

The Encratite interpretation was not the only one. In the *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, which we quoted above to show the prevailing role of the future resurrection, the adversaries of Paul—here called Demas and Hermogenes—are said to have maintained, in contrast with the Apostle, that the resurrection was passed already "in the children which we have, and we rise again when we have come to the knowledge of the true God"[80]. Here we find two explanations: (a) resurrection in the generation of children, which is clearly *not* the view of the Encratites, and (b) in the knowledge of the true God. The best discussion of this text is still to be found in Theodor Zahn's *Einleitung zum Neuen Testament*[81]. He pointed out that the phrasing of the latter explanation is rather awkward and is missing in some MSS.; it looks like an interpolation. The former exegesis is given by a number of ancient expositors; it may be derived from Jewish ideas, as was held by Lock, though the texts he mentions are not decisive[82]. If that was the correct interpretation, these teachers did not win much following in the early Church. The second explanation may have been added by somebody who knew of teachings which identified the resurrection with accepting the truth. Zahn referred to a fragment of Hippolytus in his writing *On the Resurrection*, addressed to the empress Julia Mammaea[83]. He says that the deacon Nicolaus, inspired by an alien spirit, maintained that the resurrection has come to pass already, understanding by resurrection "that we believe in Christ and received baptism", but rejected a resurrection of the flesh. He had, according to Hippolytus's testimony, great success; many founded sects, the Gnostics, among whom were Hymenaeus and Philetus. It is hard to say what is truth or fancy here; it is nevertheless remarkable that Hippolytus's story does not look as if it were derived from 2 Tim. 2:18, because these teachers were not the originators of the teaching, but were brought in afterwards. Did he possess some trustworthy tradition? One might be somewhat suspicious, since this story turns up a century and a half after the life of this Nicolaus, who is generally depicted as an apostate and arch-heretic by the Church writers[84]. Similar teaching is ascribed by Irenaeus to other leaders of heresies, namely Simon and Carpocrates, who deceived many by their magic[85], but, says the bishop of Lyons, their magic arts did not avail much, for they could not raise the dead as Jesus, the apostles and the members of the Church could do, so "that they do not even believe this can possibly be done, and hold, that the resurrection from the dead is simply an acquaintance with that truth which they proclaim"[86].

What did the Valentinian Gnostics believe in this respect[87]? Tertullian, in the opening passages of his book on our subject, makes it clear that the heretics in general did not like to speak much on the resurrection, because they laid all their emphasis on the salvation of the soul[88]. But it is not sufficient to say simply that Valentinus denied the resurrection of the flesh[89]. For, although Tertullian reckons Valentinus as belonging to a group of "impugners of the resurrection"[90], he goes on to say that the Valentinians asserted that the resurrection was past already. Their position was somewhat more subtle than Origen suggests, when he is quoted by Jerome[91] as stating that heretics like Valentinus denied the resurrection of the body and the flesh and attributed salvation only to the soul and that a reference to our Lord's resurrection as a basis for men's was vain, because the Lord was also risen in a seeming-body. According to Epiphanius they deny the resurrection of the flesh, calling it mythical and ridiculous, because "not this body arises, but something else out of it, which they call spiritual; but only of those who among them are called pneumatics, and of the so-called psychics, if they practise righteousness", while the third category, the hylics or fleshly are completely lost. The pneumatics will be saved with another, a more inward body, that they fancifully call the spiritual body[92]. Here we find the rigid division of mankind into three classes, each with its own destiny on earth and after death, which may have been the strict, dogmatic conception of the school.

But in their intercourse with the church-people they followed a different line. Irenaeus says that they imitate the phraseology of the Church and make complaints that "when they hold doctrines similar to ours, we, without cause, keep ourselves aloof from their company ... and call them heretics". To those willing to listen to them "they describe in private the unspeakable mystery of their Pleroma" by adducing all sorts of biblical texts. If one asks questions or makes objections, they "affirm that he is not capable of receiving the truth and not having from above the seed derived from their Mother. But he who follows their teachings and accepts their 'redemption', is puffed up to such an extent, that he thinks, he is neither in heaven nor on earth, but that he has passed within the Pleroma" with the pompous air of a cock[93]. Various forms of such a 'redemption' are reproduced elsewhere by Irenaeus[94], of one he says, "they hold that the knowledge of the unspeakable Greatness is itself perfect redemption. For since both defect and passion flowed from ignorance the whole substance of what was thus formed (σύστασις) is destroyed by knowledge; and therefore knowledge is the redemption of the inner man". Though the word "resurrection" is not found here, it is clear what they understood by it. They affirmed also, "that immediately

upon their death they will pass above the heavens and the Demiurge, and go to the Mother or to that Father whom they have feigned''[95].

Even more explicit on these teachings is Tertullian, to whom Puech and Quispel have aptly referred[96]. He says that these heretics expand the usage of allegory even to this question and assert ''that even death itself must be spiritually understood''. Death, then, is not the physical separation of body and soul, ''but ignorance of God, whereby man, being dead to God, lies low in error.... So also ... the resurrection must be maintained to be that by which a man, having come to the truth, has been re-animated and revivified to God.... Thereafter, then, having by faith obtained resurrection, they are ... with the Lord, whom they have put on in baptism''. These people, so Tertullian reports, were very clever in conversing with other Christians, ''pretending that they too admit the resurrection of the flesh'', and they even say: ''Woe to him who has not risen again in the flesh''. This may sound correct but they meant thereby: ''Woe to him who has not while he is in this flesh obtained knowledge of heretical secrets''. Tertullian also quotes another conception that was current among them: ''resurrection is the release of the soul''; the appeal that the dead shall rise from their tombs means to them that the soul must escape from the world or the body which imprisons it.

So the Valentinians did not flatly deny the resurrection; they even took over phrases which were used in the preaching and teaching of the Church, but they gave them their own interpretation. It is clear that there was direct intercourse between the members of the Church and these Valentinian teachers who attached great value to belonging to the Church.

In surveying the evidence we notice a great variety of opinion, so that it is not possible to speak of a body of teaching generally accepted by all ''heretics''. In some cases there is a flat denial of the resurrection, but the Valentinians held a somewhat more veiled position. As was the case with their use of the Bible they kept the words, but used them in another sense, gave them another meaning[97]. Whether they motivated it by saying that the resurrection had come to pass already, is not clear from the evidence available. It is not so strange to find this attitude among the Valentinians, because on the whole one gets the impression that of all Gnostics they were the party most attached to the Church.

If the ''resurrection of the dead'' was the great comfort and hope for those Christians who ''expected the resurrection of the dead and the life of the future age'', as Aristides wrote in his *Apology*[98], it was the great stumbling-block for the educated Greeks and for those who were impressed by their arguments. For these certainly made an impression by their logic and, above all, by their appeal to a certain religious or

philosophical sentiment which considered this present world inferior and without real relation with the ideal, "heavenly" world. The Christians shared their faith in the resurrection of the dead with the main stream of the Jews, cf. in the Eighteen Prayers: "Blessed is Jah who quickens the dead." But it is curious to see that, although we read of some disputes between Jews and non-Jews on this point[99], it did not stand at the centre of the attacks on Judaism, whilst in the second century the Christians had to fight here a fierce struggle. I cannot deal with the interesting question as to why this was the case, at the present moment, but I mention it here because it throws into relief how vital it was for those who believed in the risen Lord. I think the answer must be that in Judaism the Law and its observation were the essential thing, while Christianity was in its essence eschatological.

The church writers defended the "resurrection of the dead", which was formulated even more sharply by the phrase "resurrection of the flesh", with various arguments. Their main point was the omnipotence of God, the creator of the earth; they tried to show its plausibility by arguments from nature. Their main concern was to maintain the totality of man, body and soul, and his responsibility towards God, his creator. In the last resort the struggle between the Church and the Greeks and Gnostics turned on the conception of God: is He creator of this world or not?—on the break between God and man: is sin a mistake of nature or man's revolt against God's will?—on the meaning of the world and history. These decisive questions were at stake; and it is the greatness and importance of these issues still that makes the study of second-century Christianity and its relation to Gnosticism so fascinating.

The Creed which, according to Irenaeus, "was accepted by the whole Church wherever it was dispersed in the world"[100], contained the clause that "Jesus shall raise up all flesh of all mankind in order that He may pass a righteous judgment over all". This rule of the Church was no longer in dispute when the battle with the Gnostics of various professions was over. Then the emphasis changed to totally different questions. But, when the battle was still being waged in the second century, one of the main storm centres was this point: the resurrection and the judgment which was combined with it.

In this struggle the *Epistle to Rheginos on the Resurrection* took its place. Now we see clearly of what importance it was that its author so strongly rejected arguments of some philosophical sort and so strenuously emphasized that it was a matter of faith. It was not an apologetic treatise, but gave a certain interpretation of the phrase accepted in the Church. It is of an unmistakably Gnostic character, but it wants to stay within the Church. It is not ashamed of the Christian name and does not want to surrender to philosophy.

With regard to its relation to the New Testament, we must say that the writer wants to base himself on the Christian teaching; this letter contains, as Puech-Quispel have shown, a great number of reminiscences of the NT. The writer quotes the Gospel, though we cannot tell which one, and St. Paul. In the latter case, however, it is not a literal citation and the clause: "We went to heaven with him" (Jesus), which is essential for the author's argument, finds no parallel in the existing Pauline letters. Must we conclude that it is apocryphal? That would be highly significant for the situation in which he stood! Even when his phraseology recalls that of St. Paul, it is only one side (see above, p. 254) and we cannot tell what he did with the other.

In spite of his wish to accept the Christian teaching on the resurrection he gave it a different turn: it is akin to that interpretation of which Irenaeus and Tertullian spoke, and that may have been the kind of teaching Justin Martyr[101] had in view. If that is correct, the work is a product of Valentinianism as it existed about AD 150.

Why was this different turn given to that central doctrine? Not to please outsiders, but to fit the Gnostic conception of the Pleroma and the world. Here lies the real difference. It is the great question, to which I see no answer, at present, why this Valentinian with *this* idea of the deity was so deeply attached to Christianity. That this was merely a trick of the devil, as the Church Fathers maintained, is not a really satisfactory explanation. Future research into the origin of Christian Gnosticism will have to pay attention to it far more than has been the case so far.

This treatise finds its place within Christianity and Gnosticism, both of which it presupposes, yet it does not throw light on the vexed questions of the origins of Gnosticism, of a possibly pre-Christian Gnosticism.

The value of this newly discovered writing lies in the fact that here we have an authentic document of Gnostic faith which speaks for itself and helps us to evaluate the testimony of the Church Fathers. It is a witness of the great struggle which the Christians had to fight in the second century and it opens various perspectives on an age that formed a critical and decisive epoch in the history of Christianity.

Additional Notes

In preparing these lectures I collected a few notes which could not be incorporated into the body of the lectures, but may follow here as additional material to the commentary and as a tribute to the editors. These notes follow the system of the commentary and refer to pages and lines of the text.

P. 43 [26] Cf. Porphyry, *ad Marcellam*, 9: ἀπαιδευσία μὲν τῶν παθῶν πάντων μήτηρ; τὸ δὲ πεπαιδεῦσθαι οὐκ ἐν πολυμαθείας ἀναλήψει, ἐν ἀπαλλάξει δὲ τῶν ψυχικῶν παθῶν ἐθεωρεῖτο. Cf. also Ἀι γνῶμαι τῶν Πυθαγορείων, 2 in: *The Sentences of Sextus*, ed. H. Chadwick (Texts and Studies, N.S. v), Cambridge 1959, p. 84.

P. 44 [7] Justin, *Dial.*, II 3: after having conversed for some time with a Stoic philosopher he leaves him ἐπεὶ οὐδὲν πλέον ἐγίνετό μοι περὶ θεοῦ (οὐδὲ γὰρ αὐτὸς ἠπίστατο οὐδὲ ἀναγκαῖον ἔλεγε ταύτην εἶναι τὴν μάθησιν)—*Dial.*, II 5 πολλά τε ἐπαινέσας ταῦτα τὰ μαθήματα καὶ ἀναγκαῖα εἰπὼν ἀπέπεμπέ με.

P. 44 [8-10] Cf. Ps. Apuleius, *Asclepius*, 18: Neque enim omnes, sed *pauci* quorum ita mens est ut tanti beneficii capax esse possit.—Other texts in: J. J. Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum Graecum* I, 343; H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1922, Bd. I, p. 883.

P. 44 [31] Cf. also Heraclion, fr. 34 ... τὴν τῶν θεριζομένων σωτηρίαν καὶ ἀποκατάστασιν τῷ ἀναπαύεσθαι αὐτὸν ἐπ' αὐτοῖς.

P. 45 [16-17] Cf. 1 Cor. 7:31; 1 Joh. 2:17.

P. 45 [20-21] Cf. 2 Cor. 4:18.

P. 45 [31ff.] Very interesting is the oracle of Alexander of Abonuteichos for Rutilianus (in Lucian, *Alexander*, 34), "first you were the son of Peleus, afterwards Menander, next what you now seem to be, μετὰ δ' ἔσσεαι ἠλιὰς ἀκτίς". Here is the idea of the sun-beam combined with reincarnation.

P. 46 [28-29] Is this an application of the parable of the Wise and Foolish Virgins (Mt. 25:1 ff.)?

P. 47 [17] Χόριον, cf. Origen (*c. Cels.*, VII 32) who speaks about the soul which needs a body suited to the nature of that environment in the resurrection. In the first place, it bears this body after it has put off the former body, which was necessary at first but which is now superfluous in its second state.... When it came to be born into this world, it put off the *afterbirth*, which was useful for its formation in the womb of the mother, so long as it was within it (καὶ ἀπεξεδύσατο μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν τῇδε γένεσιν ἐρχομένη τὸ χρήσιμον πρὸς τὴν ἐν τῇ ὑστέρᾳ τῆς κυούσης <διάπλασιν>, ἕως ἦν ἐν αὐτῇ, χόριον).

—Porphyry, *ad Marcellam*, 32: εἰ μὴ τὸ σῶμα οὕτω σοι συνηρτῆσθαι φυλάξεις ὡς τοῖς ἐμβρύοις κυοφορουμένοις τὸ χόριον ... οὐ γνώσῃ σεαυτήν ... ὥσπερ οὖν τὸ χόριον συγγενόμενον καὶ ἡ καλάμη τοῦ σίτου, τελεωθέντα δὲ ῥίπτεται ἑκάτερα, οὕτω καὶ τὸ συναρτώμενον τῇ ψυχῇ σπαρείσῃ σῶμα οὐ μέρος ἀνθρώπου· ἀλλ' ἵνα μὲν γαστρὶ γένηται, προυφάνθη τὸ χόριον, ἵνα δὲ ἐπὶ γῆς γένηται, συνεζύγη τὸ σῶμα ('Αι γνῶμαι, 106 in *The Sentences of Sextus*, ed. Chadwick, p. 92-3). Cf. also the important note of H. Chadwick (in his translation of *Contra Celsum*, Cambridge 1953, p. 420) who quotes Strabo XV 1:59: 'The Brahmans have much conversation about death. They think that this life is like the period of the embryo in the womb, and that for students of philosophy death is a birth unto the true and happy life'; other texts referred to are Seneca, *Epist.* CII 23; Marc. Aurelius, IX 3:4 and Eusebius, *Theoph.*, I 72.

P. 48 [1-12] The sequence Elias—Moses, also in Marcion, according to Tertullian, *Adv. Marc.*, III 22 and Epiphanius, *Pan.*, XLII, scholia 17 (see also A. von Harnack, *Marcion: das Evangelium vom fremden Gott*, [2] Leipzig 1924, p. 202*).

P. 48 [36-38] But the church fathers, too, speak about "being changed" in connexion with 1 Cor. 15:50, following St. Paul.

P. 49 [9ff.] Cf. Porphyry, *ad Marcellam*, 10: εἰ μελετῴης εἰς ἑαυτὴν ἀναβαίνειν συλλέγουσα ἀπὸ τοῦ σώματος πάντα τὰ διασκεδασθέντα σου μέλη καὶ εἰς πλῆθος κατακερματισθέντα ἀπὸ τῆς τέως ἐν μεγέθει δυνάμεως ἰσχυούσης ἑνώσεως. συνάγοις δ' ἂν καὶ ἑνίζοις τὰς ἐμφύτους ἐννοίας καὶ διαρθροῦν συνκεχυμένας καὶ εἰς φῶς ἑλκεῖν πειρωμένη.

P. 49 [15-16] See also Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Carnis*, XXVII 8 and the note of Evans, op. cit., p. 253.

P. 49 [29-30] Porphyry, *ad Marcellam*, 10: καὶ λοιπὸν τὰ γνωσθέντα διὰ τῶν ἔργων ἀσκοῦσα.

P. 49 [38] Cf. James, 1:5: παρὰ τοῦ διδόντος θεοῦ πᾶσιν ἁπλῶς καὶ μὴ ὀνειδίζοντος—*Odes of Solomon* III 6 "I shall be no stranger there, for with the Lord, Most High and Merciful, there is no grudging".

P. 50 [8-10] Cf. 2 Clement, xv 5: τοσαύτης οὖν χρηστότητος μεταλαμβάνοντες μὴ φθονήσωμεν ἑαυτοῖς τυχεῖν τοσούτων ἀγαθῶν.

The text of Diodorus Siculus, II 29:4 who is referred to by Puech-Quispel, is worth being quoted in full: παρὰ μὲν γὰρ τοῖς Χαλδαίοις ἐκ γένους ἡ τούτων φιλοσοφία παραδέδοται, καὶ παῖς παρὰ πατρὸς διαδέχεται, τῶν ἄλλων λειτουργιῶν πασῶν ἀπολελυμένος. διὸ καὶ γονεῖς ἔχοντες διδασκάλους ἅμα μὲν ἀφθόνως ἅπαντα μανθάνουσιν, ἅμα δὲ τοῖς παραγγελλομένοις προσέχουσι πιστεύοντες βεβαιότερον. I hope to deal with this subject more fully in another connexion.

NOTES

[1] Two lectures delivered at King's College, London, as special University Lectures of the University of London on 9 and 10 December 1963. Appeared in: *The Journal of Ecclesiastical History* XV (1964), p. 141-167.

[2] A. Böhlig-P. Labib, *Die koptisch-gnostische Schrift ohne Titel aus Codex II von Nag Hammadi*, Berlin 1962; A. Böhlig-P. Labib, *Koptisch-Gnostische Apokalypsen aus Codex V von Nag Hammadi*, Halle-Wittenberg 1963; M. Krause-P. Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphon des Johannes*, Wiesbaden 1962; M. Malinine-H. C. Puech-G. Quispel-W. Till, *De Resurrectione* (*Epistula ad Rheginum*), Zürich-Stuttgart 1963 (with the assistance of Dr. R. McL. Wilson and Dr. J. Zandee).

[3] F. C. Burkitt, *Church and Gnosis*, Cambridge 1932.

[4] Cf. C. Colpe-E. Haenchen-G. Kretschmar, 'Gnosis', in: *Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart*[3], Tübingen 1958, vol. II, p. 1648 ff.

[5] S. Giet, *Hermas et les Pasteurs*, Paris 1963, p. 7; R. M. Grant, 'The Fragments of the Greek Apologists and Irenaeus', in: J. N. Birdsall-R. W. Thomson (eds.), *Biblical and Patristic Studies in Memory of Robert Pierce Casey*, Freiburg i. Br. 1963, p. 179.

[6] P. J. van Leeuwen, *Het christelijk onsterfelijkheidsgeloof*, 's-Gravenhage 1955 (thesis Groningen).

[7] J. Zandee, 'De opstanding in de brief aan Rheginos en in het Evangelie van Philippus', in: *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift*, 1962, p. 361 ff.

[8] H. C. Puech-G. Quispel, loc. cit., p. xxv ff.

[9] Cf. H. G. Liddell-R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon*[9], Oxford 1940, s.v.

[10] A. J. Festugière, *La Révélation d'Hermès Trismégiste*[2], Paris 1950, i, p. 335 ff.

[11] See the note of Puech-Quispel, loc. cit., x. 19; W. C. van Unnik, *Nestorian Questions on the Administration of the Eucharist*, Haarlem 1937 (thesis Leyden), p. 94 ff.

[12] Cf. J. Lehrs, *De Aristarchi Studiis Homericis*[3], Leipzig 1882, p. 197 ff.

[13] Lehrs, op. cit., p. 214.

[14] Tertullian, *De Resurrectione Carnis*, 63.

[15] Irenaeus, *Adversus Haereses*, v 31:1.

[16] A. J. Festugière, loc. cit., p. 309 ff.

[17] See the note of Puech-Quispel, loc. cit., p. 30 f.

[18] I Clement, 24; Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*, I 13; Tertullian, *Apol.*, XLVIII 7; Minucius Felix, 34; *3rd Epistle to the Corinthians*, 26.

[19] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 6:1.

[20] A. von Harnack, *Lehrbuch der Dogmengeschichte*[5], Tübingen 1931, p. 289.

[21] W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der Apokryphen*, Tübingen 1909, p. 375.

[22] Cf. the note of Puech-Quispel, loc. cit., p. 20.

[23] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 1:3; I 2:6.

[24] A. Houssiau, *La Christologie de Saint Irénée*, Louvain-Gembloux 1955, p. 37 f.

[25] Other texts will be found in Houssiau, loc. cit., p. 36, n. 6 and p. 37, n. 2.

[26] Barnabas 5:6; Justin Martyr, *Apol.*, LXII 16, cf. also 2 Tim. 1:10.

[27] 1 Cor. 15:20, 23; cf. also Rom. 8:29, Col. 1:18, Rev. 1:5; 1 Clement, 24:1; Ignatius, *Trall.*, IX 2; Polycarp, *Philip.* II 2; (Ps.) Justin, De *Resurr.*, 1; *Epist. Apost.*, XXI 25; 3 Cor. 31-35; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, V 7:1; Tertullian, *Apol.*, XLVIII 8; Hippolytus, fr. 8.

[28] This idea has been fully treated by Puech-Quispel, loc. cit., p. xiv. ff. and p. 28 f. in a most interesting and illuminating discussion.

[29] See 'Appended Note' at the end of this article.

[30] Cf. the expression of Aristides, *Apol.*, xv 1 about Jesus: σάρκα ἀνέλαβε.

[31] Cf. Rom. 6:11.

[32] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, vii 32.

[33] The German title of my book *Newly Discovered Gnostic Writings*, London 1960.

[34] O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*[2], Freiburg i. Br. 1914, p. 412 f.

[35] E. Evans, *Tertullian's Treatise on the Resurrection*, London 1960 (quotations from Tertullian's work are taken from Evans's translation; in other cases, unless otherwise stated, the English translation is that of the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*). The text quoted is from ch. 1.

[36] Minucius Felix, xxxiv 11.

[37] *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, v (M. R. James, *The Apocryphal New Testament*, Oxford 1924, p. 273).

[38] *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, xii (James, op. cit., p. 275).

[39] *Mart. Polycarpi*, xiv. Cf. also Justin, *Dial.*, xlvi, p. 7: "undergo extreme penalties, and rejoice in death, believing that God will raise us up by His Christ, and will make us incorruptible".

[40] Letter of Lugdunum and Vienna in Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist.*, v 1:62.

[41] (Pseudo) Justin, *De Resurrectione*, x, cf. also *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, xiv (the new teaching of the Christians).

[42] Athenagoras, *De Resurrectione*, xiv.

[43] L. Boliek. *The Resurrection of the Flesh*, Amsterdam 1962 (thesis Free University), p. 29.

[44] Mark 12:18 ff. and parallels.

[45] 1 Cor. 15:20.

[46] 1 Cor. 15:12.

[47] Acts, 17:32.

[48] Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis*, iii.

[49] H. Chadwick, 'Origen, Celsus, and the Resurrection of the Body', in: *Harvard Theological Review* xli (1948), p. 83 ff.; L. Boliek, loc. cit., p. 40 ff.

[50] Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis*, lxiii.

[51] Origen, *Contra Celsum*, vii 32 (trs. H. Chadwick, Cambridge 1953).

[52] See the interesting articles by R. M. Grant, 'The Resurrection of the Body', I-II, in: *The Journal of Religion* xxviii (1948), p. 120 ff., p. 188 ff.

[53] Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis*, i.

[54] In Origen, *Contra Celsum*, v 14.

[55] I Clem. 27:2; Just. Martyr, *Apol.*, xix.; Athenagoras, *De Resurrectione*, ix; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, v 3, 2-3; Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis*, lvii; *Apoc. Petri* (eth. text), in James, *Apoc. N.T.*, p. 512.

[56] Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*, i 13.

[57] Minucius Felix, 11.

[58] Athenagoras, *De Resurr.*, iv; Tatian, *Oratio ad Graecos*, vi; Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis*, iv; Porphyry, fr. 94; cf. Harnack in the *Apoc. Petri* (eth. text). James (op. cit., p. 512) reacts against this opinion: "And the wild beasts and the fowls shall he command to restore all the flesh that they have devoured, because he willeth that men should appear; for nothing perisheth before God, and nothing is impossible with him, because all things are his".

[59] Origen, *Contra Cels.*, v 14.

[60] Origen, *Contra Cels.*, v 61.

[61] Justin, *Dial.*, lxxx.

[62] Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis*, ii.

[63] *Epistle of the Apostles*, 5 (the Creed, 9-12) (resurrection of Jesus; cf. ch. 12: "confessing our sin that we had been unbelieving"), James, op. cit., p. 487 ff.

[64] *Epistle of the Apostles*, 22-25, James, op. cit., p. 493 f.; see also the discussion of C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, Leipzig 1919, p. 345 ff.

[65] Polycarp, *Ad Philipp.*, VII 2.

[66] This is based upon the expression "firstborn of Satan" which, according to Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, III 3:4, was applied to Marcion by Polycarp; but see W. Bauer, *Die Briefe des Ignatius von Antiochia und der Polykarpbrief*, Tübingen 1920, p. 291 f., who rejects this exegesis.

[67] *The 3rd Epistle to the Corinthians* 10-15, James, op. cit., p. 289.

[68] In 24, James, op. cit., p. 290: "And as for that which they say, that there is no resurrection of the flesh, they indeed shall have no resurrection UNTO LIFE, BUT UNTO JUDGEMENT, 25 because they believe not in him that is risen from the dead, NOT BELIEVING NOR UNDERSTANDING, 26 for they know not, O Corinthians, the seed of wheat or of other seeds (grain), how they are cast bare into the earth and are corrupted and rise again by the will of God with bodies, and clothed"; then follow some OT examples (Jonas, Elisha and Elijah raising the widow's son).

[69] A. F. J. Klijn, 'The Apocryphal Correspondence between Paul and the Corinthians', in: *Vigiliae Christianae* XVI (1963), p. 22.

[70] *Didascalia Apostolorum*, ed. R. H. Connolly, Oxford 1929, p. 202, p. 240 ff.

[71] (Ps.) Justin, *De Resurr.*, II.

[72] Ps. Tertullian, *Adv. Haer.*, resp. ch. 4, 6, 9, 12, 15, 16, 19.

[73] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, V 2:2.

[74] Tertullian, *De Resurr. Carnis*, II.

[75] Tertullian, *De Resurr. Carnis*, IV.

[76] See the commentary of M. Dibelius-H. Conzelmann, *Die Pastoralbriefe*[3], Tübingen 1955, p. 52 ff.

[77] Clement of Alexandria, *Stromat.*, III 6:28:1.

[78] Epiphanius, *Panarion*, XLVII 1:8.

[79] Cf. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 28:1.

[80] *Acts of Paul and Thecla*, XIV, James, loc. cit., p. 275.

[81] Th. Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*[3], Leipzig 1906, Bd. I, pp. 491, 17, 492.

[82] W. Lock, *The Pastoral Epistles*, Edinburgh 1936, p. 99 f. But it is not out of place to refer to the remarks about the Sadducees in Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, IX 29.

[83] In the edition of H. Achelis, Bd. I, pp. 2, 251.

[84] See the extensive note of Th. Zahn, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*, Leipzig-Erlangen 1924, Bd. I, p. 265 ff.

[85] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 23, 25.

[86] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, II 31:2.

[87] It is interesting to read the comments of a non-Christian, Indian philosopher, the present President of India, in S. Radhakrishnan, *Eastern Religions and Western Thought* (1939), Galaxy edition, Oxford 1959, p. 206 f.: "The doctrine of the resurrection of the body is opposed to the Gnostic view, which separated spirit and body. If personal existence is possible only in the body of the flesh, the dead will remain dead until the date of the general resurrection. If we cannot exist without the flesh, no one whose flesh is dead can be said to be alive. Its position was not impossible so long as the last day was believed to be imminent, but when it receded into the background the Gnostic view seemed more attractive. For the Gnostic the chief object of man was to set free his spiritual nature from its material imprisonment, and this can be accomplished by gnosis or sacramental rites". However, the "great church" rejected this view altogether (cf. Origen, *De Principiis*, II 10:1), even though the date of the Parousia was uncertain, and professed against Gnosticism its faith in the resurrection of the dead or of the flesh.

[88] Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis*, II.

[89] So Ps. Tertullian, *Adv. Haer.*, XII.

[90] Tertullian, *De Praescr. Haer.*, XXXIII.

[91] Origen, ap. Hieronymus, *Epist.*, XXXVIII.

[92] Epiphanius, *Pan.*, XXXI 7:5.

[93] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, III 15:2.

[94] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 21.
[95] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, V 31:2.
[96] Tertullian, *De Res. Carnis*, XIX.
[97] Cf. Tertullian, *De Praescr. Haer.*, XXXVIII 7.
[98] Aristides, *Apol.*, XV 3.
[99] See Talmud Babli, *Sanhedrin* fol. 90b-91a.
[100] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 10:1.
[101] See above, p. 261.

DIE „GEÖFFNETEN HIMMEL" IN DER OFFENBARUNGS-VISION DES APOKRYPHONS DES JOHANNES*

Die reiche Forschungsarbeit des verehrten Jubilars hat sich speziell auf zwei Gebieten betätigt: in der Exegese des NTs und in der Erhellung der noch immer so dunklen Welt der Gnosis. Seine scharfsinnigen Analysen und kritischen Fragen sind immer fördernd, auch wo man dann und wann in den Resultaten nicht mitmachen kann. Für dies alles, aber besonders auch für seine persönliche Freundschaft mir gegenüber, möchte ich ihm herzlich durch diese kleine Arbeit danken, in der Gnosis und NT zusammen verbunden sind. So sei sie zugleich auch ein Zeichen von der Verbindung, die zwischen Münster und Utrecht besteht.

Zu den bei den Gnostikern sehr beliebten Büchern zählte, wie in den letzten Jahren bekannt geworden ist, das Apokryphon des Johannes[1]. In seiner jetzt vorliegenden Form ist es vor allem in seinen Eingangspartien eine Verbindung von sehr verschiedenen Stücken, obwohl sich doch in der ganzen Anlage des Buches ein gewisser, bewußter Plan nicht verkennen läßt. Wegen dieser Beschaffenheit ist es lohnend, spezielle Teile gesondert zu betrachten. Diese Arbeit sei der Form der Eingangsvision gewidmet.

Es wird erzählt, wie Johannes nach einem Gespräch mit einem Pharisäer in Zweifel gerät über die Sendung des Erlösers und die Art des Aeons, zu dem der Mensch geht. Dann heißt es:

„ Sogleich, als ich das dachte, öffneten sich die Himmel und die ganze Schöpfung erstrahlte in einem Licht, das [nicht irdisch] ist und die [ganze] Welt (Κόσμος) [erzitterte]. Ich fürchtete mich und [warf] mich [nieder]". (Cod. Berol. 8502, p. 20-21, ed. Till, S. 81-83), oder:

„Sofor[t als ich dieses in meinem H]erzen [dachte], [öffneten sich die Himmel und die ganze Schöpfung] war hell [.....] den untern Teil des Himmels; und [die ganze Welt] bewegte sich. Ich fürchtete mich und warf mich nieder" (Codex Cair. II, p. 1, ed. Krause-Labib, S. 111)[2].

In den beiden anderen Kairiner Codices sind die Blätter mit dieser Partie verloren. Obwohl der Text also stark verstümmelt überliefert worden ist, steht die Sache, die uns hier interessiert, wohl fest: während seiner Verzweiflung öffnen sich die Himmel — ein helles Licht glänzt, und die Welt bebt; deshalb fürchtet Johannes sich.

In seinem Kommentar bemerkt Giversen hierzu: „The author has cited the phenomena which are usually cited in the N.T., in connection with a revelation", und dann führt er an: Mt. 3:16 Lc. 3:21 Apc. 4:1 Act. 7:56 Joh. 1:51 Apc. 19:11; daneben noch in Nachfolge von Walter

Till, *Pistis Sophia* 7:6[3]. Es ist richtig, daß an diesen Stellen von einem ,,geöffneten Himmel'' gesprochen wird, aber es bleiben doch noch einige Fragen übrig: ist der Verfasser des *Apokryphons des Johannes* in dieser Hinsicht vom NT abhängig? Gehören all diese Stellen zu einer gewissen stereotypen Form? Woher stammen die anderen Motive (Licht; Erdbeben)? Finden diese Motive sich nur im NT oder auch anderswo, entweder in der jüdischen Tradition oder in nichtjüdischen Quellen? Es versteht sich, daß diese Fragen von Bedeutung sind zur Feststellung des Verhältnisses dieses gnostischen Autors einerseits zum NT, anderseits zur Religiosität des Synkretismus.

Da Hans Bietenhard in seiner Arbeit über ,,die himmlische Welt''[4] diese Sache nicht besprochen hat und Traubs Besprechung[5] m.E. sehr ungenügend ist, möchte ich das Motiv der ,,geöffneten Himmel'' hier etwas genauer betrachten.

Wenden wir uns zuerst zum AT.

In Gen. 7:11 in der Beschreibung der Sintflut wird gesagt: τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ταύτῃ ἐρράγησαν πᾶσαι αἱ πηγαὶ τῆς ἀβύσσου, καὶ οἱ καταρράκται τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἠνεῴχθησαν.

Psalm 77 (78): 23 καὶ ἐνετείλατο νεφέλαις ὑπεράνωθεν
καὶ θύρας οὐρανοῦ ἀνέῳξεν[6]
24 καὶ ἔβρεξεν αὐτοῖς μαννα φαγεῖν
καὶ ἄρτον οὐρανοῦ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς.

Jes. 24:18 beschreibt die Schrecken des Gerichts über die Erdbewohner, die nicht entfliehen können ὅτι θυρίδες ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἠνεῴχθησαν, καὶ σεισθήσεται τὰ θεμέλια τῆς γῆς. 19 ταραχῇ ταραχθήσεται ἡ γῆ, καὶ ἀπορίᾳ ἀπορηθήσεται ἡ γῆ.

Jes. 63:19 (64:1) ἐὰν ἀνοίξῃς τὸν οὐρανόν, τρόμος λήμψεται ἀπὸ σοῦ ὄρη, καὶ τακήσονται (hier ist ἀνοίξῃς nicht Übersetzung des gewöhnlichen פתח, sondern von קרע = σχίζω, vgl. unten bei Mc. 1:10).

Hes. 1:1 ἐγὼ ἤμην ἐν μέσῳ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας ἐπὶ τοῦ ποταμοῦ τοῦ Χοβαρ, καὶ ἠνοίχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ καὶ εἶδον ὁράσεις θεοῦ.

Aus diesem Material geht hervor, daß man es hier mit einer Vorstellung des Himmels zu tun hat, bei der das Himmelsgewölbe als eine Mauer angesehen wird; darin befinden sich Türen, die dann und wann geöffnet werden[7]. Da zeigt sich ein persönliches Eingreifen Gottes zum Heil seines Volkes (Ps. 77:23) oder zum Gericht (Gen. 7:11 Jes. 24:18, 63:19). Bei diesem Gericht treten Schrecken und Erdbeben auf. In Hes. 1:1 ermöglicht die Eröffnung der Himmel eine Vision; es soll bemerkt

werden, daß dieser Text der einzige im AT ist, wo ein Prophet eine solche Offenbarung bekommt.

In den Pseudepigraphen finden wir die Vorstellung in *Henoch* 14:15 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄλλη θύρα ἀνεωγμένη κατέναντί μου. Beer übersetzt: „Siehe, da war ein anderes Haus, größer als jenes; alle seine Thüren standen vor mir offen"[8]. Dies bedeutet im ganzen Zusammenhang nicht den Anfang einer Vision, sondern das Weiterfortschreiten; Henoch sieht jetzt mehr als vorher, nämlich das Allerheiligste.

Daneben sei hingewiesen auf *Test. Lev.* 2:6. Levi ist im Schlaf und sieht einen hohen Berg καὶ ἰδοὺ ἀνεῴχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί „und ein Engel Gottes sprach zu mir: ‚Levi, geh hinein' ". „Und ich ging aus dem ersten Himmel in den zweiten" usw. Hier ermöglicht die Eröffnung den Eintritt und die Himmelsreise.

Test. Lev. 5:1 καὶ ἐν τούτῳ ἤνοιξέ μοι ὁ ἄγγελος τὰς πύλας τοῦ οὐρανοῦ „Und ich sah den heiligen Tempel und auf dem Throne der Herrlichkeit den Höchsten". Dann wird er wieder zur Erde geführt (v. 3).

Test. Lev. 18:6. Nach dem Gericht über die Sünder wird ein neuer Priester eingesetzt und kommt die Heilszeit: οἱ οὐρανοὶ ἀνοιγήσονται „und aus dem Tempel der Herrlichkeit wird über ihn Heiligkeit kommen". Hier wird also nicht von einer Vision gesprochen; es wird in der Zukunft stattfinden, wenn Himmel und Erde an der Heilszeit teilnehmen.

Test. Jud. 24:2. Nach der Zeit der Sünde Israels, der Strafe und Buße wird Gott das Volk aus dem Exil ins Land zurückführen; dann wird der Stern aus Jakob aufgehen, der neue König, καὶ ἀνοιγήσονται ἐπ' αὐτῷ οἱ οὐρανοί, „auszugießen den Segen des Geistes vom heiligen Vater". Auch hier ist es eine Gnadengabe der Heilszeit, wodurch der Segen auf den König kommen kann.

Apoc. Baruch syr. 22:1. Nachdem Baruch stark gefastet und gebetet hat (K. 21): „Darnach, siehe! thaten sich die Himmel auf, und ich sah es, und die Kraft ward mir [wieder] gegeben, und eine Stimme ward aus den [Himmels-]Höhen vernommen, und sie sagte zu mir: ‚Baruch, Baruch! Warum beunruhigst du dich?' " Dann kommt die Offenbarung (K. 22-30).

Neben diesen Stellen, die der „apokalyptischen" Literatur entnommen sind, muß auch 3 Macc. 6:18 erwähnt werden. Da wird erzählt, wie die Juden im Hippodrom gefangen sind und die wilden Tiere gegen sie losgelassen werden; die Juden schreien zum Himmel τότε ὁ μεγαλόδοξος παντοκράτωρ καὶ ἀληθινὸς θεὸς ἐπιφάνας τὸ ἅγιον αὐτοῦ πρόσωπον ἠνέῳξεν τὰς οὐρανίους πύλας, ἐξ ὧν δεδοξασμένοι δύο φοβεροειδεῖς ἄγγελοι κατέβησαν und diese bringen einen Umschwung: die Tiere stürzen sich auf die Heiden, und die verfolgten Juden werden gerettet.

Hier ermöglicht die Aufschließung der Himmelstür das Auftreten der himmlischen Kämpfer. Es ist eine Gebetserhörung. Man beachte, daß Gott persönlich die Türe öffnet. Es darf bemerkt werden, daß Josephus in seiner Wiedergabe (c. *Ap.* II 53 ff.) diesen Zug nicht erwähnt. Ist das zufällig oder bewußt[9]?

Jetzt möchten wir das NTliche Material vorführen.

Von großer Bedeutung ist es, daß diese Vorstellung als ein fester Bestandteil der Taufe Jesu genannt wird.

Mc. 1:10 nach der Taufe καὶ εὐθὺς ἀναβαίνων ἐκ τοῦ ὕδατος εἶδεν σχιζομένους τοὺς οὐρανοὺς καὶ τὸ πνεῦμα ὡς περιστερὰν καταβαῖνον εἰς αὐτόν· 11 καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν κτλ.

Mt. 3:16 βαπτισθεὶς δὲ ὁ Ἰησοῦς εὐθὺς ἀνέβη ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος· καὶ ἰδοὺ ἠνεῴχθησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδεν πνεῦμα θεοῦ καταβαῖνον ὡσεὶ περιστερά, ἐρχόμενον ἐπ' αὐτόν· 17 καὶ ἰδοὺ φωνὴ ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν κτλ.

Lc. 3:21 καὶ Ἰησοῦ βαπτισθέντος καὶ προσευχομένου ἀνεῳχθῆναι τὸν οὐρανὸν 22 καὶ καταβῆναι τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον σωματικῷ εἴδει ὡς περιστερὰν ἐπ' αὐτόν καὶ φωνὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενέσθαι κτλ.

Für unseren Zweck ist es natürlich nicht nötig, diese Geschichte ganz zu exegesieren. Es sei nur darauf hingewiesen, daß es sich hier nicht um eine Offenbarung himmlischer Geheimnisse handelt, wie in Hes., *Test. Levi* und *Henoch*. Die Eröffnung des Himmels ermöglicht das Kommen des Geistes und die Stimme. Man darf m.E. nicht mit Traub[10] sagen, daß das Sichöffnen des Himmels „Jesus als den Messias, seine Taufe als Beginn des eschatologischen Geschehens bezeichnen" will; denn dies Motiv ist nicht ausschließlich eschatologisch; die Messianität Jesu wird mit dem Geist gegeben. Das Öffnen des Himmels haben wir schon in vielen Anwendungen gesehen.

Noch Einiges sei hier bemerkt: a) Mc. hat als Besonderheit σχίζω das m.W. an keiner anderen Stelle in einem solchen Zusammenhang auftritt. b) Mt. unterstreicht mit dem doppelten ἰδού etwas sehr Auffallendes und Unerwartetes[11]; man findet dieses ἰδού auch in *Henoch, Test. Levi, Baruch*. c) In Lc. findet sich als Besonderheit das Gebet Jesu, wobei man auch den angeführten Passus aus *Baruch* vergleichen kann[12].

Im Joh.-Ev. begegnet die Vorstellung in 1:51: Amen, amen sage ich euch, ὄψεσθε τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγότα καὶ τοὺς ἀγγέλους τοῦ θεοῦ ἀναβαίνοντας καὶ καταβαίνοντας ἐπὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου. Die Kommentatoren verweisen dabei auf Gen. 28:12, aber es ist merkwürdig, daß hier im Joh.-Ev. nicht von einer Leiter, die fest auf der Erde steht, gesprochen wird; hier ist das Bild anders, wahrscheinlich muß man sagen, minder anthropomorph geworden: der Himmel ist geöffnet, und deshalb besteht die Möglichkeit des ungebrochenen Verkehrs zwischen der himmlischen Welt und Jesus auf Erden.

In Act. 7:56 sagt Stephanus, πλήρης πνεύματος ἁγίου (v. 55): ἰδοὺ θεωρῶ τοὺς οὐρανοὺς διηνοιγμένους καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ ἀνθρώπου ἐκ δεξιῶν ἑστῶτα τοῦ θεοῦ. In v. 55 ist beschrieben, wie Stephanus gespannt zum Himmel aufblickt und die Herrlichkeit Gottes und Jesus sieht. Hier findet sich wieder das ἰδού (s. oben). Es ist natürlich etwas sehr Besonderes, denn der Mann, der der Lästerung gegen Gott und Moses bezichtigt wurde (6:11) und dessen Worte solchen Widerstand aufgerufen haben (7:54), wird einer Vision Gottes gewürdigt. Die geöffneten Himmel erlauben ihm, in die göttliche Welt hineinzuschauen, ja Gottes Herrlichkeit — bekannte Umschreibung[13] — und Jesus als den Weltrichter zu sehen.

Act. 10:11 erzählt, wie Petrus in Ekstase gerät καὶ θεωρεῖ τὸν οὐρανὸν ἀνεῳγμένον καὶ καταβαῖνον σκεῦός τι. Nach einem Dialog über das Essen und die Scheu vor Unreinem, der sich dreimal — bezeichnend für die Bedeutung — wiederholt, εὐθὺς ἀνελήμφθη τὸ σκεῦος εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν. Über die Bedeutung der Vision ist Petrus voller Zweifel (v. 17). Hier ist das Motiv wieder genannt, um die Möglichkeit des Niederkommens des Gefäßes anzudeuten; denn nicht der geöffnete Himmel, der ein Schauen in die unbekannte Welt gewährt, sondern das Gefäß ist hier das Bedeutende, auf das alles ankommt. Dabei soll auch unterstrichen werden, daß in diesem Falle die Vision nicht Sicherheit gibt und Zweifel wegschafft, sondern eben den Apostel unsicher macht.

Schließlich seien zwei Stellen aus der Apokalypse erwähnt: 4:1 μετὰ ταῦτα εἶδον, καὶ ἰδοὺ θύρα ἠνεῳγμένη ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ, eine Stimme befiehlt dem Apokalyptiker hinaufzukommen, weil ihm gezeigt werden wird, was geschehen soll καὶ εὐθέως ἐγενόμην ἐν πνεύματι· καὶ ἰδοὺ θρόνος ἔκειτο ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ. Hier steht wieder das ἰδού (s. oben). Die Vorstellung ist wohl diese, daß Johannes eine geöffnete Tür sieht, dorthin hinaufsteigt und dann weiter in die Himmel hineinschauen kann und die Thronvision hat. Diese Einleitung ist anders, mehr akzentuiert als die der anderen Visionen[14].

19:11 καὶ εἶδον τὸν οὐρανὸν ἠνεῳγμένον, καὶ ἰδοὺ ἵππος λευκός, καὶ ὁ καθήμενος ἐπ' αὐτόν κτλ. Hier ist nicht das Besondere, daß der Himmel geöffnet ist, sondern die Erscheinung des Pferdes; sein und seines Herren (v. 14) Hervorkommen wird jetzt ermöglicht[15]. Man kann hiermit vergleichen die oben angeführte Stelle 3 Macc. 6:18.

In der altchristlichen Literatur des 2. Jh.s wird die Vorstellung ganz selten gefunden. M.W. nur einmal in dem mit dem Apokryphon Johannis wohl gleichaltrigen *Pastor Hermae, Vis.* I 1:4 προσευχομένου δέ μου ἠνοίγη ὁ οὐρανὸς καὶ βλέπω τὴν γυναῖκα ἐκείνην ἣν ἐπεθύμησα, die ihn aus dem Himmel grüßt; er fragt, was sie dort tut, und sie antwortet, sie sei dort, um die Sünden des Hermas dem Herrn bekannt zu machen. In I 2:1 folgt dann: μετὰ τὸ λαλῆσαι αὐτὴν τὰ ῥήματα ταῦτα ἐκλείσθησαν οἱ

οὐρανοί und Hermas zittert und ist betrübt. In den weiteren Offenbarungen des Buches wird dieses Motiv nicht mehr erwähnt. Hier sieht man deutlich, wie konkret die Vorstellung mit dem Schließen als Kontrast zu dem Eröffnen ist.

Die Öffnung gibt hier die Möglichkeit, die Frau zu sehen. Die Offenbarung ist besonders unangenehm für Hermas; er bleibt nach Beendigung der Vision in heftiger seelischer Bewegung.

Daneben in der *Apokalypse des Petrus* (aeth. Text) 17[16]. Im Anschluß an die Verklärungsgeschichte (Mc. 9:2 ff.) wird da Folgendes erzählt: ,,Und eine ganz große und glänzend weiße Wolke kam über unser Haupt und nahm unseren Herrn und Moses und Elias auf. Und ich erbebte und entsetzte mich. Und wir blickten auf und der Himmel öffnete sich und wir sahen Menschen im Fleische, und sie kamen und begrüßten unseren Herrn und Moses und Elias und stiegen auf in den zweiten Himmel''. Diese Himmelfahrt ist Erfüllung der Schrift Ps. 24:6 ff.[17]. ,,Darauf wurde der geöffnete Himmel wieder geschlossen.'' Hier soll bemerkt werden, daß die Öffnung des Himmels nicht die Einleitung zu einer Vision ist, sondern die Möglichkeit des Eintretens Jesu und seiner Begleiter in den Himmel gibt; man kann wohl sagen, es sei das Gegenstück der Apc. 19:11.

In der *Epistula Apostolorum* 51 (62) heißt es am Ende dieser Beschreibung der Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung: ,,Und wie er sprach, traten Donner und Blitz und Erdbeben ein, und die Himmel spalteten sich, und eine leichte Wolke kam und nahm ihn fort''[18]. Die Übersetzer verweisen hier auf Act. 1:9; das mag wohl richtig sein, aber dabei fällt doch auf, wie die Szene in dieser Epistula ausgeschmückt ist mit verschiedenen Zügen von Naturerscheinungen. Die Eröffnung der Himmel ist hier nicht Einleitung zu einer Offenbarung, sondern ermöglicht die Himmelfahrt.

Im gnostischen Buch *Pistis Sophia* 1 4 (S. 4, C. Schmidt-W. Till) wird beschrieben, wie die Jünger ängstlich sind eines Erdbebens wegen und sich fragen: ,,Vielleicht wird der Erlöser alle Örter zerstören. Während sie nun dieses sagten und gegeneinander weinten, da taten sich die Himmel um die neunte Stunde[19] des folgenden Tages auf, und sie sahen Jesus herabkommen, gar sehr leuchtend, und es war kein Maß für sein Licht ... Denn er leuchtete mehr als zu der Stunde, da er zu den Himmeln hinaufgegangen war [20], so daß die Menschen auf der Welt das Licht, welches an ihm war, nicht beschreiben konnten.'' Hier ist also die Eröffnung des Himmels die Einleitung, damit der Herr niedersteigen kann.

Schließlich sei noch erwähnt die Beschreibung der Taufe Jesu im Ebionitenevangelium, fr. 3 (bei Epiphanius, *Pan.* xxx 13:7 f.)[21]: καὶ ὡς

ἀνῆλθεν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὕδατος ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοί, καὶ εἶδεν τὸ πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον ἐν εἴδει περιστερᾶς κατελθούσης καὶ εἰσελθούσης εἰς αὐτόν. καὶ φωνὴ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ... καὶ εὐθὺς περιέλαμψε τὸν τόπον φῶς μέγα. Das Besondere dieser Darstellung ist die Lichterscheinung; diese ist nicht wie in der *Pistis Sophia* direkt mit Jesus verbunden, sondern das Licht erstrahlt nach dem Kommen des Geistes und der Stimme. Es ist wohl bekannt, daß diese Tradition im Ebionitenevangelium nicht vereinzelt dasteht. S.Z. hat Walter Bauer das Material mit bekannter Sorgfalt zusammengestellt[22]. Aber dabei muß bemerkt werden, daß die Zeugnisse nicht ganz eindeutig sind. In den zwei altlateinischen Codices und bei Justin erscheint das Licht (Justin: Feuer) *während* der Taufe und im Wasser[23]; in den Diatessaron-Zeugen wie im Ebionitenevangelium *nach* der Taufe[24]. Diese Zeugnisse, die doch alle wohl aus dem 2. Jh. stammen, sind darin einig, daß sie irgendwie mit der Taufe Jesu eine Lichterscheinung verbinden, gehen jedoch auseinander bei der Fixierung dieser Erscheinung in der Taufgeschichte.

Soweit das christliche Material aus den ersten zwei Jahrhunderten[25]. Jetzt fragen wir, ob es neben den bereits erwähnten Stellen in den Pseudepigraphen noch andere einschlägige Texte in der Umwelt des jungen Christentums gibt. Bei dieser Umschau ist es bemerkenswert, daß Billerbeck überhaupt keine Parallele bietet. Auch in der griechischen Literatur findet man nichts Diesbezügliches. Die Verweisungen bei Bauer[26] beschränken sich auf zwei Stellen in den Zauberpapyri, die nicht frei von jüdischem Einfluß[27] sind, und jedenfalls ebenso wie die angeführte Inschrift spät (aus dem 3. oder 4. Jh.)[28]. Auch der Aufruf im *Corpus Hermeticum* XIII, 17 (Nock-Festugière II, S. 207) hilft nicht weiter. Dodd hat auch hier jüdischen Einfluß aufgezeigt[29] und die Parallele: ἀνοίγηθι γῆ. ἀνοιγήτω μοι πᾶς μόχλος ὄμβρου. τὰ δένδρα μὴ σείεσθε ... ἀνοίγητε οὐρανοί, ἀνεμοί τε στῆτε, zeigt, daß man es hier mit dem „Himmel" als Teil der ganzen Natur zu tun hat und daß der Verfasser sich etwas anderes vorstellte, als was man in der Bibel und den Pseudepigraphen findet.

In der lateinischen Literatur dagegen gibt es wohl einige interessante Texte. Das Material, das E. Klostermann anführte[30], kann noch vermehrt werden:

Cicero, *De divinatione* I 43:97 nennt neben anderen Naturerscheinungen *quibus portentis magna populo Romano bella perniciosaeque seditiones denuntiabantur* auch: *cum coelum discessisse visum est*[31]. In seinem bedeutenden Kommentar hat A. S. Pease noch verwiesen auf I 44:99 portenta am Anfang des Bellum Marsiacum: *deorum simulacra sudavisse et sanguinem fluxisse et discessisse caelum et ex occulto auditas esse voces* II 28:60: *ita te nec terrae fremitus nec caeli discessus nec lapideus aut sanguineus imber aut traiectio stellae nec faces visae terrebunt*, denn man soll die natürliche Ursache aufspüren.

Livius, *A.U.C.* XXII 1: *Faleriis coelum findi velut magno hiatu visum quaque patuerit ingens lumen effulsisse* (s. später Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* VIII: 20:3).

Vergilius, *Aeneis* IX 20 Iris ist erschienen:

> *medium video discedere caelum*
> *palantisque polo stellas. sequor omina tanta,*

wozu Servius bemerkt: *in auguralibus libris inter ostenta etiam caelum discessisse dicitur.* Diese Aeneis-Stelle wird auch von Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* VII 20:3 angeführt: *Quid ergo? Non aliquando lacuna secedentis retro aetheris patuit et vastum in concavo lumen? Exclamare posset* (sc. Posidonius)[32], folgt *Aen.* IX 20[33].

Silius Ital. I 535ss. *Hic subitas scisso densa inter nubila caelo*
erupit quatiens terram fragor, et super ipsas
bis pater (Iuppiter) intonuit geminato fulmine pugnas.

Hier ist das Motiv in einem anderen Zusammenhang gebraucht wie in den vorher angeführten Stellen. Denn da handelte es sich um bestimmte merkwürdige Naturereignisse, die als *portenta* oder *omina* ein Vorzeichen besonderer, meistens schreckenerregender Geschehnisse auftreten. Hier ist es ein Donnerschlag, bei dem der Himmel sich spaltet und die Erde bebt.

Schließlich sei noch hingewiesen auf Ovidius, *Fasti* III 370 ff.

> *credite dicenti: mira, sed acta, loquor.*
> *A media caelum regione dehiscere coepit;*
> *summisere oculos cum duce turba suo;*
> *ecce, levi scutum versatum leniter aura [decidit,*

denn Iuppiter sendet auf Numas Geheiß das Ancile vom Himmel. In der Beschreibung Ovids möchten wir die Worte *mira* und *ecce* unterstreichen.

In diesem Material aus lateinischen Quellen dürfen wir noch auf folgendes hinweisen:

a) es wird hier gesprochen von *findi* (Liv.), *scindere*; dabei sei erinnert, wie Markus von σχίζω spricht; im NT steht das vereinzelt da (s. auch *Epist. apost.* 51 [62]) und auch in den jüdischen Quellen findet es sich nicht (doch vgl. Jes. 63:19 im MT). Matthäus und Lukas haben das geändert in ἀνοίγω (siehe auch Jes. 63:19 LXX), das in der ,,Bibelsprache'' das gewöhnliche ist. Das ,,Öffnen'' wird jedoch bei den lateinischen Autoren nicht genannt.

b) In diesen Texten wird auch verschiedene Male von einer Lichterscheinung gesprochen: Livius, Seneca, Silius (Blitz). Dabei sei erinnert an die Beschreibung der Himmelfahrt in *Ep. apost.* und die Nachrichten vom Licht bei der Taufe Jesu (s. oben S. 278 f.). Zur Erklärung hat man

verschiedene Überlegungen angestellt[34]; die können wohl richtig sein, aber es mag auch sein, daß das „Licht" in der Anschauung der Alten selbstverständlich mit dieser Erscheinung am Himmel gegeben war.

Wenn wir jetzt zu dem Material in den jüdischen und altchristlichen Schriften zurückblicken, sehen wir, daß dort diese Erscheinung nicht ein Vorzeichen von etwas Kommendem ist, sondern unmittelbar mit der Offenbarung zusammenhängt; sie erlaubt Einblicke in die himmlische Welt (das wird in den lateinischen Quellen nirgendwo gesagt) oder direkte Verbindung zwischen Himmel und Erde. In verschiedenen Fällen wird sie erwähnt, während der Sehende in einem visionären Zustand ist, oder wird er für die Heilszeit versprochen. In diesem Zusammenhang ist es bemerkenswert, daß diese Erscheinung bei Jesus und Stephanus in diesem Leben auftritt; dadurch wird das Besondere am Anfang von Jesu messianischem Wirken und am Ende des verworfenen Zeugen stark unterstrichen.

Wir haben in diesem Aufsatz das Material so vollständig, wie es uns jetzt bekannt ist, gesammelt und mit seinem Kontext vorgeführt. Denn nur so zeigt sich, daß das Motiv in sehr verschiedenen Zusammenhängen auftritt. Man kann nicht einfach so etwas sagen wie: „ein ständiges Motiv bei Offenbarungen" mit Angabe ausgewählter Stellen. Es ist zwar richtig, daß das Motiv in Offenbarungen auftritt, aber es muß daneben gesagt werden, daß es auch viele Offenbarungsgeschichten gibt, in denen es nicht vorkommt; so fällt es auf, daß es im AT bei den Propheten nur in der Vision von Hesekiel erwähnt wird, denn bei Jesaja hat es eine ganz andere Bedeutung. Es ist also kein literarischer „Topos". In den jüdisch-altchristlichen Texten ist es nicht so sehr eine Naturerscheinung, sondern hängt zusammen mit der Vorstellung einer himmlischen Welt, die von dieser irdischen Welt durch eine Mauer, das Himmelsgewölbe, geschieden ist. Wenn sich da eine Öffnung auftut, ermöglicht sie die Verbindung dieser zwei Welten, meistens zum Segen, aber zuweilen auch zum Gericht.

Kehren wir jetzt nach dieser Umschau zur Offenbarungsvision in dem Johannes-Apokryphon zurück. Die Züge, mit denen sie beschrieben wird, finden sich auch anderswo: das Licht — sowohl in der Verbindung mit der Taufe Jesu und bei der Himmelfahrt (*Epist. apost.*) als auch bei den lateinischen Autoren (cf. S. 280), das Zittern der Welt — Jes. 24:18; 63:19, *Epist. apost.* und bei Cicero, *De div.* II 28:60, Silius It. Die Furcht und das Niederfallen des Sehers ist auch eine gewöhnliche Reaktion, der man immer wieder begegnet, z.B. in *Henoch* 14:13 f. und anderswo (eine Anzahl von Stellen aus dem NT wird von W. Bauer[35] verzeichnet). Weil dieser Zug so oft vorkommt, soll man jedoch nicht den Fehler machen, ihn ohne Weiteres für traditionell zu erklären. Denn es ist ganz selbstver-

ständlich, daß die Leute, die einer solchen Vision gewürdigt werden, von einem Schauer überfallen werden. Natürlich standen sie solchen schreckenerregenden Erscheinungen nicht kalt und unbewegt gegenüber.

Diese Vision kommt hier, wie im *syr. Baruch* (S. 275), wenn der Autor voller Zweifel und Fragen ist, aber es wird hier nicht erwähnt, daß er betet. In Act. 10:11 dagegen bewirkt die Vision die Zweifelsfragen.

Wenn wir also den Text dieser Vision betrachten im Zusammenhang mit anderen Offenbarungsszenen, wo die Öffnung des Himmels beschrieben wird, so müssen wir sagen, daß dieser Verfasser nicht ein literarisches Schema wiederholt oder nach einer bestimmten Vorlage arbeitet, daß seine Beschreibung in Züge gefaßt wird, die auch bei anderen Autoren vorkommen, um solch ein wunderbares Erlebnis einer himmlischen Manifestation wiederzugeben. Es ist deutlich, daß er mehr in der jüdisch-christlichen als in der römischen Tradition steht, daß seine Beschreibung aber auch für Leute in der „heidnischen" Welt wohl verständlich war. Die später folgende gnostische Offenbarung wird hier also eingeleitet mit einer Beschreibung, wie sie für solche Offenbarungen geeignet war.

ANMERKUNGEN

* Erschienen in: *Apophoreta. Festschrift für Ernst Haenchen*, Berlin 1964, S. 269-280.

[1] Siehe die Ausgaben von W. Till, *Die gnostischen Schriften des Koptischen Papyrus Berolinensis*, Berlin 1955, (T.U. Bd. 60); M. Krause-P. Labib, *Die drei Versionen des Apokryphons des Johannes im koptischen Museum zu Alt-Kairo*, (Abhandlungen des Deutschen Archäologischen Instituts Kairo, Koptische Reihe, Band 1), Wiesbaden 1962.

[2] S. Giversen, *Apocryphon Johannis, the Coptic Text of the Apocryphon Johannis in the Nag Hammadi Codex II*, (Acta Theologica Danica vol. V), Copenhagen 1963, S. 47-49 übersetzt: „Immediately [when I thought this the heavens were opened and] the whole (ἅ[πας]) [creation shone] with a light (ἀκτίς) [which came] from heaven, and [the world] trembled. [I was afraid and I] saw in the light..."

[3] S. Giversen, l.c., S. 154. — H. C. Puech, 'Gnostische Evangelien und verwandte Dokumente', in: E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*[3], Tübingen 1959, Bd. I, S. 235 hat dazu keinen Kommentar.

[4] H. Bietenhard, *Die himmlische Welt im Urchristentum und Spätjudentum*, Tübingen 1951.

[5] H. Traub, 'οὐρανός D. 4', in: G. Kittel-G. Friedrich, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament*, Stuttgart 1954, Bd. V, S. 529-530.

[6] Vgl. demgegenüber Lc. 4:25 ὅτε ἐκλείσθη ὁ οὐρανός in der Zeit Elias (III Reg. 17), und Apc. 11:6 οὗτοι ἔχουσιν τὴν ἐξουσίαν κλεῖσαι τὸν οὐρανόν, ἵνα μὴ ὑετὸς βρέχῃ (cf. Jos. 5:17), eine Zeit der Dürre und Hungersnot.

[7] Die Vorstellung habe ich besprochen in meinem Artikel: 'De achtergrond en betekenis van Handelingen 10:4 en 35', in: *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* III (1949), S. 336 ff. [Englische Übersetzung in: *Sparsa Collecta* I, S. 213-258].

[8] G. Beer bei: E. Kautzsch, *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*, Tübingen 1900, Bd. II, S. 245. — Die folgenden Zitate aus den Pseudepigraphen sind dieser Übersetzung entlehnt.

[9] War die Aussage über Gott im 3 Macc. zu anthropomorph nach Josephus' Empfinden?

[10] H. Traub, a.a.O., S. 529 f.

[11] S. meinen Aufsatz 'Der Befehl an Philippus', in: *ZNW* XLVII (1956), S. 183. [siehe *Sparsa Collecta* I, S. 328-339]

[12] Über die parallele Szene im Ebionitenevangelium s. oben S. 278 f.

[13] G. Kittel, 'δόξα', in: Kittel, *Theol. Wörterbuch*, Bd. II, S. 251.

[14] Vgl. E. Lohmeyer, *Die Offenbarung des Johannes*[2], Tübingen 1933, S. 45 z.St.

[15] R. H. Charles, *The Revelation of St. John*, Edinburgh 1920, vol. I, S. 107: „where the whole heaven is opened, as it were, that the armies of heaven might go forth in the train of the Son of God".

[16] Übersetzung von H. Weinel, in: E. Hennecke, *Neutestamentliche Apokryphen*[2], Tübingen 1924, S. 327.

[17] S. darüber, daß Ps. 24 in dieser Weise ausgelegt wurde, E. Kähler, *Studien zum Te Deum und zur Geschichte des 24. Psalms in der alten Kirche*, Göttingen 1958. — Über die Petrus-Apokalypse, S. 53 ff. — Kähler hat nicht verwiesen auf Irenäus, *Adv. Haer.* III 16:8 ἵνα καὶ τὸν αὐτὸν εἰδῶς Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν ᾧ ἠνοίχθησαν αἱ πύλαι τοῦ οὐρανοῦ διὰ τὴν ἔνσαρκον ἀνάληψιν αὐτοῦ; wohl werden a.a.O., S. 57 andere Stellen verzeichnet; die Vorstellung war dem Irenäus also ganz geläufig.

[18] Übersetzung von H. Duensing, bei E. Hennecke-W. Schneemelcher, *Neutest. Apokryphen*, S. 155. — Wajnberg bei C. Schmidt, *Gespräche Jesu mit seinen Jüngern nach der Auferstehung*, Leipzig 1919, S. 154 übersetzt: „und es rissen sich die Himmel auf".

[19] Vgl. Act. 3:1 als Gebetszeit, vgl. (H. L. Strack-)P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, Stuttgart 1924, Bd. II, S. 696 ff.

[20] Das ist beschrieben in Kap. 3.

[21] Text bei E. Klostermann, *Apocrypha II: Evangelien*[3], Berlin 1929, S. 14.

[22] W. Bauer, *Das Leben Jesu im Zeitalter der Apokryphen*, Tübingen 1909, S. 134 ff.

[23] Die lateinischen Codices haben: *et cum baptizaretur (Jesus), lumen ingens (magnum) circumfulsit (fulgebat) de aqua, ita ut timerent omnes qui advenerant (congregati erant)*; die Verschiedenheit weist wohl auf eine griechische Vorlage hin. Sie haben diesen Text zwischen Mt. 3:15 und 3:16, also vor der Eröffnung des Himmels. — Justinus, *Dial. c. Tryphone* 88 κατελθόντος τοῦ Ἰησοῦ ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ καὶ πῦρ ἀνήφθη ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ, vgl. auch *Sib. Orac.* bei Bauer, a.a.O., S. 136.

[24] Bauer, a.a.O., S. 135.

[25] In der späteren arabischen Petrusapokalypse, ed. A. Mingana, *Woodbrooke Studies III*, Cambridge 1931, S. 115 liest man: „In the tenth hour of the night the doors of heaven are opened and the prayer of the priests and of the faithful are answered". — In der griechischen Baruch 11-15, ed. M. R. James, *Apocrypha Anecdota II*, in: *Texts and Studies V 1*, Cambridge 1897, S. 92 f. handelt es sich um Türen im 5. Himmel, vgl. auch *Apoc. Pauli* 7-10, ed. C. Tischendorf, *Apocalypses Apocryphae*, Lipsiae 1866, p. 37-40. — *Didache* 16:6 σημεῖον ἐκπετάσεως ἐν οὐρανῷ wird von R. Knopf, *Die Lehre der Apostel, die beiden Klemensbriefe*, Tübingen 1920 und J.-P. Audet, *La Didachè*, Paris 1958, z. St. auch von der Öffnung des Himmels verstanden, aber das ist höchst unsicher und wird oft auch anders interpretiert.

[26] W. Bauer, *Wörterbuch zum Neuen Testament und der übrigen Urchristlichen Literatur*[5], Berlin 1958, Sp. 141.

[27] K. Preisendanz, *Griechische Zauberpapyri*, Berlin I 1928 und Berlin-Leipzig II 1931: IV 1178 ἀνοίγηθι, οὐρανέ, δέξαι μου τὰ φθέγματα (für jüdischen Einfluß, vgl. 1200-1201, 1228 ff.), XXXVI 298 ff.: ἠνοίγησαν οἱ οὐρανοὶ τῶν οὐρανῶν καὶ κατέβησαν οἱ ἄγγελοι τοῦ θεοῦ καὶ κατέστρεψαν τὴν πεντάπολιν Σόδομα καὶ Γόμορρα.

[28] G. Kaibel, *Epigrammata Graeca*, Berlin 1878, S. 364.

θειολόγου Λαίτοιο μετάρσιον ὕμνον ἀκούσας
οὐρανὸν ἀνθρώποις εἶδον ἀνοιγόμενον·
εἰ κατὰ Πυθαγόρην ψυχὴ μεταβαίνει ἐς ἄλλον,
ἐν σοί Λαῖτε, Πλάτων ζῇ πάλι φαινόμενος.

„III fere seculi".

[29] C. H. Dodd, *The Bible and the Greeks*, London 1935, S. 240-241 (Festugière, z. St., stimmt dem zu).

[30] E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium*[4], Tübingen 1929, S. 9.

[31] A. S. Pease, *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione* (Nachdruck), Darmstadt 1963, S. 270.

[32] Vgl. auch Seneca, *Nat. Quaest.* I 14:1: *sunt chasmata cum aliquod spatium caeli decedit et flammam velut dehiscens in abdito ostentat*; Plinius, *Nat. Hist.* II 96 (XXVI): *Fit et caeli ipsius hiatus quod vocant chasma.* Für χάσμα verweist Pease, l.c. auf Aristoteles.

[33] M. E. gehört nicht Vergilius, *Aen.* VIII 523 ff. hierher, auf dem Wettstein, *Novum Testamentum Graecum*, Amsterdam 1751, I, S. 268 verweist, denn da handelt es sich bei ,,aperto caelo'' um einen Donnerschlag bei heiterem Himmel. — Vielleicht wohl die zweite Bedeutung, die Quintilianus VII 9, 10 (bei Wettstein ist die Ziffer 9 ausgefallen!) als Beispiel für die Zweideutigkeit des Ablativus anführt: *caelo decurrit aperto*, und expliziert: *utrum per apertum caelum an cum apertum esset.*

[34] Vgl. W. Bauer, *Leben Jesu*, S. 137 ff.

[35] W. Bauer, Wörterbuch, Sp. 1308; daneben noch viel anderes.

LES IDÉES DES GNOSTIQUES CONCERNANT L'ÉGLISE*

Lorsqu'on aborde l'étude d'un sujet en vue d'une éventuelle publication, on s'applique tout d'abord à bien délimiter son sujet en se posant certaines questions. Tantôt on observe certains faits qui appellent des éclaircissements et tantôt on part de questions formulées indépendamment de la documentation.

Dans le domaine toujours si complexe des problèmes relatifs au gnosticisme, il reste bien des points obscurs qui relèvent du premier cas. Ainsi, par exemple, quelle est la signification exacte de noms comme *Barbelo* ou *Jaldabaoth?* Ou encore, comment rendre compte de la formation et de l'évolution d'écrits comme la prédication des Naasséniens conservée par Hippolyte? Ou encore, que faut-il penser de l'*Apocryphe de Jean?* Mais aujourd'hui, c'est à un problème du second genre qu'il faut nous appliquer: quelle est l'idée d'Église que l'on rencontre chez les gnostiques? Il est certes légitime de poser cette question. Dans la mesure même où certains gnostiques se considéraient comme des chrétiens, il est normal de rechercher comment ils envisageaient l'Église.

On sait que le nombre des sources permettant de connaître les doctrines gnostiques est en constant progrès. Celui qui s'applique à les étudier, ne sera guère enclin à s'intéresser aux questions relatives à l'Église et à son organisation. Les ouvrages techniques consacrés à la gnose ne font que bien peu de place à ce genre de problèmes. Serait-ce parce que l'on a fort peu exploité jusqu'à maintenant les importantes découvertes de Nag-Hamadi? Nous aurons l'occasion d'y revenir. Mais en attendant, il faut bien constater un égal manque d'intérêt à l'autre pôle, dans les ouvrages consacrés à la théologie de l'Église aux premiers siècles. Est-ce donc l'effet du hasard? Ou s'agirait-il d'une sort de réticence inconsciente de la part des héritiers de la Grande Église vis-à-vis de ces hérétiques? Quoi qu'il en soit, un auteur comme Gustave Bardy qui a consacré un ouvrage à l'ecclésiologie du second siècle[1], ne s'occupe guère des gnostiques. Encore le fait-il en s'appuyant sur des écrivains ecclésiastiques comme Barnabé ou Origène plutôt que sur les gnostiques eux-mêmes.

Il n'est donc pas si simple d'envisager une étude de notre thème. Mais il se peut que l'examen de problèmes qui ne surgissent pas directement de la matière à étudier, permet d'aboutir à des travaux éclairants. A condition de ne pas rester systématiquement en dehors de cette matière, le procédé conduit parfois à fouiller des recoins peu explorés et à mieux considérer des aspects habituellement négligés.

Quelques observations d'abord, concernant les vocables qui formulent l'objet de notre enquête, à savoir les idées concernant l'Église et la notion même de gnostiques.

Pour ce qui concerne le premier point, je ne voudrais pas m'en tenir à une définition trop étroite de l'Église, et c'est pourquoi je choisis une expression assez large: «les idées sur l'Église». Nous n'allons pas nous borner à étudier les seuls usages du mot ἐκκλησία mais nous utiliserons aussi les autres vocables comme «peuple de Dieu», troupeau, etc. On examinera ce que les gnostiques ont éventuellement à nous dire concernant la nature de l'Église, son organisation et les formes concrètes sous lesquelles elle apparaît. Nous nous attacherons donc aussi bien à sa structure théologique qu'aux données sociologiques. Nous essayerons de déterminer sa place, son but, ce qu'elle représente comme communauté.

Pour ce qui est des gnostiques, nous n'avons pas l'intention de nous en tenir à l'usage fort lâche de ce terme, devenu courant ces derniers temps dans certains cercles, et particulièrement en Allemagne. On sait que depuis la publication de l'ouvrage de Hans Jonas: *Gnosis und spätantiker Geist*, la gnose est souvent considérée comme un courant qui, en ce qui concerne les questions relatives à l'existence humaine, rompit décidément avec les solutions préconisées par le classicisme grec autant que par le judaïsme. Parmi les représentants de ce dualisme et de cette haine du monde, il faudrait compter non seulement ceux qui furent de tout temps considérés comme des gnostiques, mais encore Philon, les Néoplatoniciens et des Alexandrins comme Origène. Certes, on veut bien admettre que des considérations phénoménologiques apportent certains élargissements des perspectives, mais il n'est pas sage de s'engager sur cette voie. On en vient, en effet, à laisser s'estomper ce que les gnostiques classiques considéraient comme important et, d'un autre côté, on est contraint de trancher certaines connexions importantes chez des hommes comme Philon ou Origène. Tout compte fait, on ne rend pas assez justice aux faits historiques dans tout ce qu'ils ont de concret. Par ailleurs, on cherche à étendre le champ du gnosticisme en s'efforçant de restituer les étapes antérieures à l'aide d'hypothèses aventureuses. On part des documents mandéens ou manichéens pour aboutir aux communautés pauliniennes. Il suffit de citer ici les travaux de Schmithals. L'aisance avec laquelle on entasse l'une sur l'autre les hypothèses, est à la mesure de graves carences dans la critique des sources, et, plus encore peut-être, dans l'autocritique. En bonne méthode, il convient de partir de ceux qui, traditionnellement, se sont présentés comme des gnostiques ou qui ont été considérés comme tels. C'est après coup qu'il sera possible d'examiner s'il y a bel et bien une sorte de pré-gnose dans les écrits néotestamentaires. Mais dans l'état actuel des travaux, il faut procéder avec une

extrême prudence, car l'étude des documents authentiquement gnostiques est loin d'être au point désirable pour aborder valablement les problèmes relatifs au Nouveau Testament. Lorsque H. Schlier, dans son commentaire de l'Épître aux Éphésiens, se sert de données des deuxième et troisième siècles pour éclairer l'œuvre de Paul ou d'un disciple de Paul, il verse dans une manière de travailler et de traiter les sources qui est, historiquement, inacceptable.

De plus, je ne comprendrai pas dans mon enquête les écrits dont l'origine gnostique est sérieusement mise en question ou franchement douteuse, tels les *Odes de Salomon* et les *Acta Apostolorum Apocrypha*. Je tiens à me limiter aux auteurs et aux ouvrages qui se sont considérés franchement comme gnostiques ou que les adversaires anciens ont catalogués de cette façon.

Ajoutons que le christianisme du second siècle, où le gnosticisme a atteint son sommet, est fort varié et complexe. Tout est encore en mouvement.

Jean Daniélou commence en ces termes le chapitre de sa *Théologie du Judéo-christianisme* consacré à l'Église: «Un des caractères les plus remarquables de la théologie judéo-chrétienne est la place qu'y occupe la doctrine de l'Église... Très tôt, l'Église apparaît consciente de son existence comme entité théologique»[2]. Et ce faisant l'auteur ne pense qu'à la doctrine théologique et non pas à tout ce qui concerne l'organisation.

Pourrait-on formuler une appréciation semblable à propos des gnostiques? Nous avons déjà fait observer que la littérature consacrée au mouvement fait peu de place aux considérations relatives à l'Église. Mais il faut encore mettre en lumière un aspect bien particulier. Bardy affirme que «c'est précisément dans les systèmes gnostiques que se développe le plus complètement la théorie de l'Église invisible»[3]. En écrivant «*les* systèmes gnostiques», il généralise indûment et il passe à côté d'une question importante. En effet, lorsqu'on examine sur quelles données l'auteur cité se base, on constate que, à une exception près, sur laquelle nous reviendrons, toutes ses références se rapportent à l'école valentinienne[4]. Est-ce un effet du hasard? De toutes façons, et quelle que soit l'importance de cette école, on ne peut parler sans plus *des* gnostiques. C'est que le vaste courant que nous appelons le gnosticisme, est beaucoup plus diversifié. Il y a certes un élément de vérité dans la remarque d'Hippolyte selon laquelle c'est à partir d'une seule et même doctrine aberrante que le gnosticisme a proliféré dans bien des sens[5]. Mais il ne faut pas estomper les différences et tout ramener à de pures variations de vocabulaire. D'entrée de jeu, il ne serait pas sage de tout réduire à un seul type. Bien au contraire, il faut observer et reconnaître toutes les nuances et la diversité au sein du même mouvement.

Notons finalement que dans une enquête concernant les idées sur l'Église, nous pouvons naturellement laisser de côté des formes étrangères au gnosticisme chrétien comme le *Corpus hermeticum*. Mais même dans les écrits gnostiques apparentés au christianisme, l'enquête n'aboutit qu'à de maigres résultats. Un ouvrage très riche comme la *Pistis Sophia* ne nous réserve absolument aucune indication. Et l'*Évangile de Philippe* est tout aussi avare en renseignements. La seule exception est constituée par les héritiers de Valentin. Mais même ici l'apport documentaire n'est pas des plus abondants. Il n'est pas question, en effet, de chercher à intégrer à notre enquête ce qui concerne les «semences de lumière» comme s'il fallait y voir une sorte de substitution de l'idée d'Église. A un vocabulaire différent correspond une autre vision des choses.

Au cours d'une enquête sur l'Église chez les gnostiques, on se heurte donc à un fait remarquable qui peut étayer notre affirmation touchant les modifications survenues au sein du gnosticisme. Dans la notice d'Irénée consacrée aux Ophites, il est question d'un éon impérissable, caractérisé de cette façon: *esse autem hanc et veram et sanctam ecclesiam, quae fuerit appellatio et conventio et adunitio Patris omnium primi hominis, et Filii secundi hominis et Christi filii eorum et praedictae feminae*[6]. Dans la version du même mythe que nous trouvons dans l'*Apocryphon Johannis*, on ne retrouve pas les mêmes expressions. La comparaison avec d'autres passages (ce qui est particulièrement net pour la fin du § 10 ss.), comparaison que la publication récente de cet apocryphe a permise, montre que la reprise, chez Irénée, s'opère sous une forme plus chrétienne. On peut conclure sans crainte qu'il y a une certaine adaptation aux manières de dire du christianisme (*sancta ecclesia*). On ne peut méconnaître une nuance polémique dans le *vera*. Sans doute voulait-on s'opposer à l'idée d'Église qui conduisait à appeler ἐκκλησία le rassemblement de ceux qui, sur terre, croient au Christ.

On peut faire des observations semblables à propos des Valentiniens. Tertullien rapporte que Valentin fut candidat à l'épiscopat à Rome et qu'on lui préféra quelqu'un qui, comme confesseur, avait de meilleurs titres[7]. Les quelques indications relatives à Ptolémée, à Héracléon ou à Théodote, permettent de conclure qu'ils faisaient usage des écrits néotestamentaires et qu'ils prétendaient en dévoiler le sens profond selon leur gnose. Ils se servaient du mythe gnostique comme d'une règle d'interprétation de l'Écriture, mais, en même temps, ils lui donnaient une allure chrétienne. Il n'y a donc pas lieu de s'étonner que ceux qui s'opposaient à la Grande Église, aient parlé eux aussi d'Église.

Mais revenons à notre question et demandons-nous s'il est accidentel que les gnostiques aient si peu parlé de l'Église. Comment rendre compte de leur silence quasi total? On le sait, l'*argumentum e silentio* est fort délicat

et il n'est presque jamais contraignant. Du «non-citer» au «non-connaître», le saut est risqué. Mais le fait que partout on ne trouve finalement que du sable mouvant, et que dans la forme christianisée de la gnose valentinienne elle-même, l'Église ne joue qu'un rôle fort modeste, tout cela est fort significatif. Si l'*Ecclesia* avait tenu une place importante dans la pensée gnostique on en trouverait tout de même quelques traces dans la *Pistis Sophia!*

La réponse à notre question dépendrait-elle de la nature de nos sources? On sait, en effet, qu'une bonne partie de notre documentation nous est parvenue par le biais d'écrits polémiques rédigés par des adversaires. Or, il arrive, dans ce genre de littérature, que l'on insiste plus sur les divergences que sur les points d'accord. Mais cet argument n'a guère de poids en l'occurrence, car les textes originaux auxquels nous avons maintenant accès ne nous offrent pas une image différente. Tout semble indiquer que les gnostiques ne mettaient pas l'accent sur une doctrine ecclésiologique et la polémique avec eux portait sur les doctrines relatives à Dieu et au Christ, comme on peut s'en rendre compte chez Irénée ou chez Tertullien.

Faut-il renoncer, pour autant, à rencontrer des notations concrètes? Que constatons-nous dans la pratique de la conjonction «Église-Gnose»? Il n'est pas aisé de fournir une réponse générale. Les données ont varié au cours des temps. Vers l'an 200, les frontières sont nettement tracées, mais avant Irénée il n'en était pas ainsi. Nous avons relevé déjà que Valentin avait brigué un siège épiscopal à Rome. Irénée relate, de son côté, que le gnostique Marcus résidait dans la maison d'un diacre dont il séduisit la femme[8]. Que certains gnostiques aient appartenu à l'Église, c'est ce que montre le *Pasteur d'Hermas*, du moins si on s'accorde avec Dibelius et Joly pour les voir visés dans un passage: οἱ πιστεύσαντες... πιστοὶ μὲν, δυσμαθεῖς δὲ καὶ αὐθάδεις καὶ ἑαυτοῖς ἀρέσκοντες, θέλοντες πάντα γίνωσκειν, καὶ οὐδὲν ὅλως γίνωσκουσι (*Sim.*, IX 22; cf. VIII 6:5)[9]. Plus explicite encore, Justin déclare que les Valentiniens, les Basilidiens et les partisans de Saturnilus s'attribuaient le titre de «chrétiens»[10]. Les Naassséniens, de leur côté, se considéraient comme de véritables chrétiens[11], et les Valentiniens se plaignaient de ce que les membres de l'Église «les tenaient à l'écart». Ils avaient donc la prétention de lui appartenir[12]. De leurs côtés, plusieurs écrivains ecclésiastiques se plaignent de ce qu'on les a confondus avec les gnostiques. C'est le cas d'Origène dans son livre contre Celse[13]. Les frontières étaient donc loin d'être tracées nettement. Cependant, les différences étaient perceptibles, puisque Irénée note que, lors de son voyage à Rome sous le pontificat d'Anicet, Polycarpe «ramena à l'Église de Dieu beaucoup des hérétiques précités» (Valentin, Marcion, etc.)[14].

Essayons de préciser davantage. Un passage d'Irénée est de nature à nous aider: *Adv. Haer.*, III 15:2. Il s'agit de combattre, avec la dernière énergie, la théorie valentinienne, selon laquelle les apôtres auraient délivré une part seulement de leurs enseignements de façon publique et qu'ils auraient réservé certains points à des privilégiés. Irénée décrit alors l'intervention des gnostiques: *Hi enim ad multitudinem propter eos qui sunt ab ecclesia, quos communes Ecclesiasticos ipsi dicunt, inferunt sermones, per quos capiunt simpliciores et illiciunt eos, simulantes nostrum tractatum, ut saepius audiant; qui etiam quaeruntur de nobis, quos quum similia nobiscum sentiant, sine causa abstineamus nos a communicatione eorum, et quum eadem dicant et eandem habeant doctrinam, vocemus illos haereticos*[15]. On le voit, Irénée reproche aux Valentiniens d'utiliser la terminologie qui a cours dans l'Église mais de lui donner un sens nouveau[16], et, partant, d'égarer les simples. S'appuyant sur certains textes comme ceux de Mc. 4:11 et 4:34, ils affirment l'existence de traditions secrètes. Ils citent notamment Mc. 4:11: «A vous il est donné de connaître les secrets du Royaume de Dieu, mais à ceux du dehors tout arrive en paraboles»; ou encore Mc. 4:34: «Il ne leur parlait pas sans parabole, mais à ses disciples il expliquait tout»[17]. Éclairante en la matière est une déclaration de Ptolémée à Flora: «On lui enseignera plus tard comment, à partir d'un principe unique et incorruptible, toutes les natures procèdent, ce qui explique dès lors leur diversité»[18].

Une série de données le montrent: les gnostiques en appelaient à une tradition apostolique secrète, ils avaient leurs propres prophètes et ils possédaient de nombreux livres de révélation . Ils insistaient surtout sur des révélations qui leur viendraient de Jésus[19]. Les découvertes de Nag-Hamadi nous en fournissent plusieurs exemples. Ces prétendues traditions sont dans la plupart des cas attribuées au Christ qui porte d'ailleurs, presque exclusivement, le titre de Docteur. Puis, viennent les principaux meneurs gnostiques qui voulaient, au témoignage d'Irénée, être considérés comme des docteurs[20]. Dans leurs enseignements particuliers, ils utilisaient de subtiles interprétations allégoriques des Écritures et prétendaient, ce faisant, apporter des approfondissements aux doctrines communes de la Grande Église.

En fait, il s'agissait surtout de doctrines secrètes qui n'étaient transmises que dans des assemblées ésotériques. C'est ce qui paraît clairement à propos d'un sacrement qui connut bien des formes, et qu'ils nommaient *apolytrôsis*. «Ils disent que celui-ci est nécessaire à ceux qui reçoivent la connaissance parfaite de telle sorte qu'ils renaissent la force qui surpasse toutes choses. Autrement, il leur serait impossible de pénétrer dans le Plérôme, étant donné que c'est lui qui mène au fond de *Buthos*. Ils ajoutent que c'est le baptême de Jésus manifesté (sur la terre) qui assure

le pardon des péchés, mais l'*apolytrôsis* du Christ descendant en lui mène seul à la perfection: le premier est psychique, le second est pneumatique»[21]. Et d'invoquer la parole de Jésus sur «l'autre baptême» (Mt. 20:22) ou ce que Paul dit de la «rédemption dans le Christ Jésus». Les docteurs gnostiques se présentaient donc eux-mêmes comme des parfaits, car personne n'était censé pouvoir les égaler quant à l'ampleur de la connaissance. Ils étaient au delà de Pierre, de Paul et des autres apôtres, et ils déclaraient en savoir plus que quiconque, car ils avaient absorbé toute l'étendue de la connaissance de l'ineffable puissance et qu'ils étaient dès lors supérieurs à toutes les puissances[22]. Un exemple typique de cette mentalité est fourni par le gnostique Marcus, qui se tailla un grand succès en proposant cette façon d'aller au delà des sacrements de l'Église.

Les gnostiques valentiniens dont ces notices nous parlent, ne formaient donc pas une contre-Église mais ils prétendaient constituer une élite «parvenue à la gnose»[23] au sein de l'Église elle-même. On peut rappeler ici le texte bien connu qui les situe par rapport à la masse des fidèles ordinaires. Ils sont les véritables spirituels (πνευματικοί) qui τὴν τελείαν γνῶσιν ἔχοντες περὶ θεοῦ καὶ τὰ τῆς 'Αχαμὼθ μεμυημένοι μυστηρία... ἐπαιδεύθησαν δὲ τὰ ψυχικὰ οἱ ψυχικοὶ ἄνθρωποι, οἱ δι' ἔργων καὶ πίστεως ψιλῆς βεβαιούμενοι καὶ μὴ τὴν τελείαν γνῶσιν ἔχοντες· εἶναι δὲ τούτους ἀπὸ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἡμᾶς λέγουσι[24].

La gnose, dans ce sens théosophique bien particulier, est présentée dans les mythes et les interprétations allégoriques des Écritures. Elle s'oppose aux bonnes œuvres et à la foi banale de la masse chrétienne. Les pneumatiques se distinguent des psychiques. De plus, selon la conception gnostique, tout ceci a un rapport avec la question du salut. Les pneumatiques sont assurés du salut, inaccessibles à la corruption, tout comme ce qui est purement terrestre en est, par nature, incapable. Quant aux chrétiens psychiques, ils ne peuvent être préservés que par les bonnes œuvres[25]. Le pneumatique est saint par nature, tandis que la masse ordinaire, l'Église psychique, est sauvée par le Sauveur[26].

On est ainsi conduit à examiner la théorie qui fonde cette distinction. Il n'est pas facile de l'exposer en quelques mots, car les gnostiques l'ont présentée sous des formes si variées que déjà Irénée était tenté de désespérer[27]. Le but que nous poursuivons ici, nous dispense d'ailleurs d'analyser les différences entre les systèmes et d'établir s'il s'agit de pures questions de vocabulaire ou de théories différentes.

Dans les divers systèmes valentiniens dont Irénée nous a conservé la teneur, on rencontre dans la première Ogdoade le couple *Homme-Église* (Ἄνθρωπος-Ἐκκλησία)[28]. On peut discuter la question de savoir si ce couple précède celui de *Logos et Zoè*, ou si il en procède. De toutes façons,

les deux couples appartiennent à la sphère divine la plus haute. On citait comme référence concernant cette *Syzygie* la parole de Paul: «Ce mystère est grand, je le dis en visant le Christ et l'Église»[29]. A bon droit, me semble-t-il, plusieurs chercheurs ont mis un lien entre cette spéculation et les spéculations sur la vieille femme d'Hermas ou encore l'Église pneumatique de 2 Clem. 14, qui offre une exégèse allégorique de Gen. 1:27[30]. La conception bien connue d'une Église préexistante est reprise et mise en relation avec le mythe gnostique.

Nous avons ici un bel exemple de la «christianisation» de certains thèmes aberrants, dont nous avons parlé plus haut. Dans un ouvrage aussi typiquement gnostique que l'*Apocryphon Johannis*, il n'y a pas trace du couple *Homme-Église*. Il faut d'ailleurs ajouter que l'on ne voit pas le lien de ces éons avec le drame de la chute et de la rédemption qui fait l'objet du mythe. Si l'on néglige quelques variations accidentelles, le mythe parle toujours de l'orgueil du dernier éon «Sagesse» qui est fière de son sous-produit «Jaldabaoth», qui est le créateur du monde. Mais celui-ci est berné parce que dans sa créature, appelée le plus souvent Adam, il y a une semence de lumière émanant du Dieu élevé et caché: c'est ce qui assure son salut par la gnose et son entrée dans le Plérôme. Dans la réalité créée de ce monde, on distingue trois catégories d'hommes: ceux qui sont entièrement soumis au créateur de ce monde ou hyliques, ceux qui occupent une position médiane car, en eux, le bien et le mal sont mélangés (psychiques), et, enfin, ceux qui possèdent la gnose ou pneumatiques[31].

Il n'y a qu'un seul texte où l'on peut observer un lien entre ces diverses classes[32]. On note que l'homme spirituel, qui a été ensemencé par l'insufflation d'Adam (Gen. 2:7), reste inconnu du Démiurge. «Car, tout comme il n'a pas connu la Mère, il n'a pas connu la semence; et c'est précisément, ajoutent-ils, ce qu'est l'Église qui est l'image (ἀντίτυπον) de l'Église d'En-Haut»[33]. Selon le gnostique Marcus, Jésus aurait été formé à l'image de l'éon *Anthropos*, qui descendit sur lui de telle manière qu'Il engloba le tout de l'Ogdoade, et notamment *Ecclesia*. C'est que Marcus travaille à partir du texte de Col. 1:19: ἐν αὐτῷ εὐδόκησεν πᾶν τὸ πλήρωμα κατοικῆσαι (voir aussi 2:9). Mais il faut ajouter que dans le système de Marcus, ni l'Église ni un des autres éons ne jouent de rôle bien défini. Des mots et pas beaucoup plus.

Dans les fragments d'Héracléon qu'Origène nous a conservés dans son commentaire de Jean, il est question, à maintes reprises, de l'Église. La Samaritaine de Joh. 4 lui apparaît comme une image de l'Église qui attendait le Christ et qui atteste qu'Il sait toutes choses (ἐπίσταται) (*fragm. 25*). Il ne s'agit pas ici de l'Église au sens large, mais de l'ensemble des pneumatiques ainsi que le *fragm. 37* le précise. Lorsque en Joh.

4:39, il est dit que beaucoup de Samaritains vinrent à la foi sur la parole de la femme, Héracléon conclut qu'il s'agit des psychiques et que la femme seule est nommée: τὴν δὲ μίαν λέγει τὴν ἄφθαρτον τῆς ἐκλογῆς φύσιν καὶ μονοειδῆ καὶ ἐνικήν. L'Église est «la maison du Père», où résident les pneumatiques et où les psychiques, qui sont en dehors du Plérôme, trouvent le salut. Le «troisième jour» est le jour spirituel du relèvement de l'Église. C'est le rassemblement des pneumatiques qui se rattachent au Sauveur, l'Homme.

Il y a donc ici une autre manière d'exprimer les choses que dans la notice d'Irénée (*Adv. Haer.*, I 8:4), où la Mère *Achamoth* était considérée en dehors du Plérôme sous la forme de la brebis perdue. Ce qu'il faut mettre en relation avec le fait que l'Église est dispersée (ἐξ ἧς τὴν ὧδε θέλουσιν ἐσπάρθαι ἐκκλησίαν). Ce n'est pas là, comme Sagnard l'a cru[34], la reprise d'une opinion courante dans l'Église, car les textes sur lesquels il croit pouvoir s'appuyer, mènent plutôt dans une autre direction comme j'ai eu l'occasion de le montrer ailleurs[35]. Tous deux partent du fait concret de la dispersion de l'Église en bien des endroits du monde; elle se trouve donc dans une dangereuse situation d'éparpillement[36].

Dans le morceau «sur les trois natures» du Codex-Jung, qui provient peut-être d'Héracléon[37], il y a quelques passages relatifs à l'Église. J'ai eu accès à ces documents grâce à l'obligeance de mon collègue Quispel et à celle du Dr Zandee d'Utrecht. Comme Quispel et Puech l'ont déjà mis en lumière, il est remarquable que l'*Ekklesia* est présente immédiatement après le Père et le Fils comme existant depuis le commencement, alors que, dans les autres systèmes valentiniens, elle n'est, liée à l'Anthropos, qu'une partie subordonnée de la première Ogdoade. L'amour du Père et du Fils se traduit en baisers et produit «l'Église de beaucoup d'hommes, celle qui existe pour les éons et qui est appelée à ce titre «l'éon des éons»[38]. L'Église est composée de ceux qui ont dépassé la maladie de la féminité et qui sont parvenus à la virilité (fol. 94). Sans doute s'agit-il ici de la féminité de la *Sophia* déchue et de la virilité du Rédempteur. Décrivant l'œuvre de rédemption du Logos, l'auteur souligne qu'il réalise le destin final des pneumatiques, à savoir, le paradis, la joie, le plérôme; ensuite le royaume, c'est-à-dire l'Église, qui les rassemble et qui a la forme de l'Église, qui est dans les éons (fol. 97), c'est-à-dire l'Église de la terre, qui est l'image de l'Église céleste, comme nous l'avons déjà vu. On en distinguera «la place de la foi et de l'obéissance de par l'espérance, la prière et les supplications» (fol. 97, 9 ss.); ce que le Dr Zandee identifie, non sans raison, avec le destin final des psychiques[39]. Finalement on parle des vexations des ennemis (fol. 122 s.), de ces hommes de la gauche auxquels l'Église est livrée, sans défense, comme son Seigneur (cf. Joh. 15:20). On parle alors des pneumatiques qui sont unis au Sauveur, car

c'est pour eux que le Christ est venu. Quant aux psychiques, ils se réjouissent de cette union de l'époux et de l'épouse dans l'attente où ils sont de la restauration plénière du Plérôme, «lorsque tous les membres du corps de l'Église auront trouvé leur place». On rencontre donc ici l'image du corps et des membres, avec, à l'arrière-plan, la dispersion à partir de laquelle s'opère le rassemblement[40]. La terminologie utilisée ici nous est bien connue par les *Excerpta e Theodoto*. Elle est typique de la gnose valentinienne.

Après avoir parcouru ainsi l'ensemble des matériaux disponibles, on est contraint de conclure qu'il y a bien peu d'éléments utilisables en vue de l'édification d'une véritable ecclésiologie. Seuls les Valentiniens s'en sont quelque peu préoccupés. Pour eux, l'Église est un éon qui fait partie de l'Ogdoade. Avec l'Homme, elle forme un couple, encore qu'elle soit parfois considérée comme une entité masculine. Quant à la réalité terrestre que nous appelons «Église», on en dit fort peu de choses. L'humanité est divisée en trois groupes, les pneumatiques, les psychiques et les hyliques. Les premiers, qui sont les gnostiques, constituent la véritable Église; les seconds vivent également dans l'Église et ils ne sont pas sans espoir encore qu'ils occupent une place inférieure à celle des pneumatiques. En fait, tout cela est typiquement individualiste, bien que l'individu ne soit qu'un spécimen de son espèce. Jésus est le rédempteur auquel l'Église est unie.

Il n'y a donc pas de quoi bâtir une bonne ecclésiologie. Nous retrouvons chez les gnostiques bien peu d'éléments propres à être intégrés dans un traité classique. Tout l'intérêt va à l'aspect «éonique» de l'Église. Tout ce qui concerne son essence, ses notes caractéristiques, son gouvernement et les tâches qui lui sont dévolues sur terre, tout cela n'est même pas envisagé. On se préoccupe seulement de déterminer les traits de ceux qui lui appartiennent, lorsqu'on envisage l'espèce d'hommes qui possèdent ou pas la «semence de lumière». Le rapport «Église» et «Royaume de Dieu» s'estompe, et il ne reste qu'un catalogue où les formules néotestamentaires sont classées selon un certain ordre. En tout cas, il n'est pas question d'un peuple de Dieu qui témoigne ou qui assume une mission au sein du monde.

A ce point de vue, la différence est considérable non seulement avec la théologie chrétienne mais encore avec Qumrân et l'apocalyptique juive. Je tiens à le souligner parce que ces derniers temps, on s'est plu à proclamer les affinités de la religion juive et du gnosticisme. Les courants juifs se préoccupent du sort du peuple de Dieu, de sa lutte pour rester un peuple saint, fidèle à la Loi. Cela est très éloigné de ce que nous trouvons chez les gnostiques. Bien plus, l'apport juif sur le point que nous avons examiné est pratiquement nul[41]. Les gnostiques travaillent avec des

vocables empruntés au Nouveau Testament auxquels ils donnent des sens ésotériques, comme Irénée l'avait bien vu[42].

Revenant à la question formulée en débutant: pour quel motif les gnostiques nous ont-ils laissé si peu d'éléments concernant la doctrine de l'Église et pourquoi l'ont-ils fait de façon si lamentable, nous pouvons lui donner une réponse claire: leur intérêt n'allait pas de ce côté. Préoccupés du Dieu inconnu et non de Celui qui a révélé sa volonté, les Gnostiques s'attachèrent à l'anthropologie et non à l'ecclésiologie. Ce fut la rançon de leur abandon de l'Ancien Testament et de leur allégorisation du Nouveau.

NOTES

* Paru dans: *Aux origines de l'Église* (*Recherches Bibliques* VII), Bruges 1965, p. 175-187.

[1] G. Bardy, *La théologie de l'Église de saint Clément de Rome à saint Irénée*, Paris 1945. Voir surtout p. 167 ss.

[2] J. Daniélou, *Théologie du Judéo-Christianisme*, Tournai 1958, p. 317.

[3] G. Bardy, op. cit., p. 167.

[4] Cf. le témoignage de Tertullianus, *Adv. Valentinianos* 1: «Valentiniani, frequentissimum plane collegium inter hereticos.»

[5] Hippolytus, *Refutatio*, v 6.

[6] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haereses*, I 30:2.

[7] Tertullianus, *Adv. Valent.*, 4.

[8] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 13:5.

[9] M. Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Tübingen 1923, p. 596 s., 630; R. Joly, *Hermas. Le Pasteur*, Paris, p. 277, n. 3; voir aussi G. Bardy, op. cit., p. 167.

[10] Justinus Martyr, *Dialogus cum Tryphone*, xxxv 5-6, cf. *Apologia*, xxvi.

[11] Hippolytus, *Refut.*, v 9.

[12] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, III 15:2.

[13] Voir par exemple Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 25: Carpocrate s'en prend à l'Église parce que ses pratiques magiques lui sont attribuées.

[14] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, III 3:4.

[15] Cf. aussi Tertullianus, *Adv. Valent.*, 1.

[16] Ainsi Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, IV 33:3.

[17] Un seul texte à titre d'illustration: Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 3:1 à propos des Valentiniens: ταῦτα δὲ φανερῶς μὲν μὴ εἰρῆσθαι διὰ τὸ μὴ πάντας χωρεῖν τὴν γνῶσιν αὐτῶν. μυστηριωδῶς δὲ ὑπὸ τοῦ Σωτῆρος διὰ παραβολῶν μεμηνύσθαι τοῖς συνίειν δυναμένοις οὕτως. I 25:5 sur les Carpocratiens τὸν Ἰησοῦν λέγοντες ἐν μυστηρίῳ τοῖς μαθηταῖς αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀποστόλοις κατ' ἰδίαν λελαληκέναι καὶ αὐτοὺς ἀξιῶσαι τοῖς ἀξίοις καὶ τοῖς πειθομένοις ταῦτα παραδιδόναι.

[18] Ptolemaeus, *Ad Floram*, VII 8-9.

[19] Un excellent recueil chez R. Lichtenhahn, *Die Offenbarung im Gnosticismus*, Göttingen 1901.

[20] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 28:1: «Eo quod multi ex ipsis, immo omnes velint doctores esse.» Voir aussi l'importante déclaration de I 11:1 à propos de Valentin: ὁ μὲν γὰρ πρῶτος ἀπὸ τῆς λεγομένης γνωστικῆς αἱρέσεως τὰς ἀρχὰς εἰς ἴδιον χαρακτῆρα διδασκαλείου μεθαρμόσας. En I 30:15, il est question de la *Valentini schola*.

[21] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 21, cf. 13:6.

[22] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 13:6.

[23] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 13:1 ss.

[24] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 6:1-2.

[25] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 6:2 poursuit de la façon suivante: διὸ καὶ ἡμῖν μὲν ἀναγκαῖον εἶναι τὴν ἀγαθὴν πρᾶξιν ἀποφαίνονται (ἄλλως γὰρ ἀδύνατον σωθῆναι), αὐτοὺς δὲ μὴ διὰ πράξεως, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ φύσει πνευματικοὺς εἶναι πάντῃ τε καὶ πάντως σωθήσεσθαι δογματίζουσιν. ὡς γὰρ τὸ χοϊκὸν ἀδύνατον σωτηρίας μετασχεῖν (οὐ γὰρ εἶναι λέγουσιν αὐτοὶ δεκτικὸν αὐτῆς), οὕτως πάλιν τὸ πνευματικόν, ὃ αὐτοὶ εἶναι θέλουσιν, ἀδύνατον φθορὰν καταδέξασθαι. Leur manière de faire n'est pas en question; elle peut être aussi bien ascétique que libertine. Nous n'entendons pas examiner ici le rapport de ces considérations avec les conceptions de saint Paul, telles qu'elles s'expriment particulièrement dans 1 Cor. Il suffit de noter que si l'on considère celles-ci en contraste avec l'enseignement gnostique, on observe une immense différence. C'est ce qui paraît le plus clairement dans l'usage de πνεῦμα et plus encore dans celui du mot φύσει, que Paul n'a jamais employé dans ce sens. Cf. les protestations d'Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, IV 37:1 ss. et celles d'Origenes, *Contra Celsum*, VI 61.

[26] Voici ce qui correspond à Rom., 11:16 chez Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 8:3; ἀπαρχὴν μὲν τὸ πνευματικὸν εἰρῆσθαι διδάσκοντες, φύραμα δὲ ἡμᾶς, τουτέστιν τὴν ψυχικὴν ἐκκλησίαν, ἧς τὸ φύραμα ἀνειληφέναι λέγουσιν αὐτὸν καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ συνεσταλκέναι, ἐπειδὴ ἦν αὐτὸς ζύμη.

[27] Voir par ex. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 18:1, 21:5.

[28] Comp. Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 11: 1; Hippolytus, *Refut.*, V 6.

[29] Eph., 5:32; Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 8:4.

[30] G. Bardy, l.c., p. 167; F. Sagnard, *La gnose valentinienne et le témoignage de saint Irénée*, Paris 1957, p. 302 s.; J. Daniélou, l.c., p. 326 ss.

[31] C'est très net chez Clément d'Alexandrie, *Excerpta e Theodoto*, 56: τὸ μὲν οὖν πνευματικὸν φύσει σῳζόμενον· τὸ δὲ ψυχικόν, αὐτεξούσιον ὄν, ἐπιτηδειότητα ἔχει πρός τε πίστιν καὶ ἀφθαρσίαν καὶ πρὸς ἀπιστίαν καὶ φθοράν, κατὰ τὴν οἰκείαν αἵρεσιν· τὸ δὲ ὑλικὸν φύσει ἀπόλλυται. Cf. Hippolytus, *Refut.* V 6 à propos des Naasséniens: «Il y a trois espèces d'êtres dans le monde: les angéliques, les psychiques et les matériels; leurs noms sont l'élu, l'appelé et le captif.»

[32] Chez Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 5:6.

[33] Une version (chez Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 7:4) rapporte qu'au moment de l'apparition du Sauveur, le démiurge aurait tout appris de lui; il se serait mis à sa disposition comme autrefois le centurion (Mt. 11:9): τελέσειν δὲ αὐτὸν τὴν κατὰ τὸν κόσμον οἰκονομίαν μεχρὶ τοῦ δέοντος καιροῦ (expression typiquement eschatologique), μάλιστα δὲ διὰ τὴν τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἐπιμέλειαν καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐπίγνωσιν τοῦ ἑτοιμασθέντος αὐτῷ ἐπάθλου, ὅτι εἰς τὸν τῆς μητρὸς τόπον χωρήσει. — Il est donc question ici d'une sorte de récupération du démiurge. Puisqu'il s'est soumis au Sauveur, la garde de l'Église lui est confiée. Il semble bien qu'il s'agit de l'Église concrète et donc d'une reprise de l'idée que le monde est créé en vue de l'Église (cf. Hermas, *Vis.*, I 1:6 et les annotations de Dibelius).

[34] F. Sagnard, l.c., p. 393 s.

[35] W. C. van Unnik, '«Diaspora» en «Kerk» in de eerste eeuwen van het Christendom', dans: *Ecclesia. Een bundel opstellen aangeboden aan Prof. Dr. J. N. Bakhuizen van den Brink*, Den Haag 1959, p. 38, 43. [traduction en anglais ci-dessus, p. 95 ss.]

[36] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, I 10:1, 2.

[37] Voir à ce propos H.-Ch. Puech-G. Quispel, *'Le quatrième écrit gnostique du Codex Jung'*, dans: *Vigiliae Christianae* 9 (1955), p. 65-102, surtout p. 95 ss.

[38] Comparez *Ex. e Theod.*, 21:3, texte à propos duquel F. Sagnard, *Clément d'Alexandrie. Extraits de Théodote* (Paris 1948, p. 99, n. 7) rappelle Héracléon, fr. 5.

[39] Lettre du 10 juillet 1962.

[40] Mais c'est fort différent de Joh., 11:52, où l'arrière-plan est celui de la Diaspora juive. Ce qu'on ne trouve pas dans l'ecclésiologie chrétienne. Cf. mon article cité, p. 199, n. 2.

[41] Cf. mon article: 'Die jüdische Komponente in der Entwicklung der Gnosis', dans: *Vigiliae Christianae* 15 (1961), p. 65-82. [voir ci-dessus, p. 199 ss.]

[42] Irenaeus, *Adv. Haer.*, III 12:12: *Scripturas quidem confitentur, interpretationes vero convertunt.* Voir aussi Tertullianus, *De praescriptione haereticorum*, 33:7 ss.

LITURGICA

LES CHEVEUX DÉFAITS DES FEMMES BAPTISÉES*

Un Rite de Baptême dans l'ordre Ecclésiastique d'Hippolyte

C'est dans l'Ordre Ecclésiastique d'Hippolyte, rédigé probablement à Rome entre 215 et 220 qu'on possède actuellement une des sources les plus anciennes et les plus importantes de cette époque pour comprendre l'histoire de la vie de l'église primitive[1].

Indépendamment l'un de l'autre, Ed. Schwartz en 1910 et R. H. Connolly en 1916 découvrirent la possibilité de retrouver un livre disparu d'Hippolyte, dont le nom seul était connu, à savoir Ἀποστολικὴ Παράδοσις. On en avait trouvé des traductions et des remaniements dans les fragments de la collection des documents sur le droit de l'église, tirés d'un palimpseste latin se trouvant à Vérone et publiés par E. Hauler en 1900, aussi bien que dans la littérature orientale sur l'organisation ecclésiastique, comme le soi-disant *Ordre Ecclésiastique Egyptien* dans plusieurs adaptations, et dans le *Testamentum Domini*. Dans quelques-unes de ces éditions postérieures il est en effet question du nom d'Hippolyte.

Ce résultat a été accepté presque généralement, malgré la réfutation de notre compatriote R. Lorentz, qui ne réussit pas à trouver d'adhérents à son opinion opposée[2]. Il serait difficile de surestimer l'importance de cette découverte. Connolly avait raison de conclure: «in the fulness and precision of its information as to the worship and regulated working of a Christian Church (it) is unique in the first three centuries»[3]. Ce ne fut pas en premier lieu la véritable «Entdeckerfreude», mais une juste appréciation des faits qui lui dicta ces paroles.

Pour ce qui concerne la connaissance de l'organisation de l'église ancienne et de son culte on en est, abstraction faite du *Didaché*, réduit presque exclusivement aux informations recueillies par ci par là dans les écrits de différents auteurs. Un exposé systématique ou un manuel fait absolument défaut. L'accent portait sur la prédication, la défense, la doctrine plus que sur les préceptes des actes et des prières. Ce ne fut qu'au quatrième siècle, lorsqu'il s'est établi une certaine consolidation, que les informations se firent plus amples, parce qu'alors on s'occupait de l'ordre ecclésiastique et du culte de façon plus consciente et plus systématique. Ainsi le développement de la vie interne de l'Eglise est sous beaucoup de rapports un chapitre obscur de l'histoire. La façon dont la vie liturgique s'est développée, les influences qu'elle a dû subir, les circonstances qui ont contribué à la former, tout cela se dérobe à maints égards à notre connaissance. Souvent des conjectures doivent prendre la

place de faits avérés. Le manuel d'Hippolyte renfermant beaucoup d'informations détaillées, il est d'une grande valeur pour l'examen du développement de la liturgie des premiers chrétiens.

Cette valeur, constituée par l'abondance des faits de l'antiquité chrétienne s'accroît encore par le fait qu'il est originaire de Rome. Cette paroisse était en relation étroite avec toute l'église. Les paroles bien connues de Juvénal se rapportant aux rivières orientales qui débouchent dans le Tibre étaient vraies au point de vue ecclésiastique tout aussi bien qu'au point de vue mondain[4]. Des hommes dirigeant la vie spirituelle de l'Asie Mineure et de l'Egypte séjournaient dans la capitale de l'empire pour une durée plus ou moins longue[5]. Il y avait une action réciproque considérable entre l'Orient et Rome. Un écrit d'origine romaine représente donc sous beaucoup de rapports l'état de l'Eglise entière.

Il y a un autre aspect auquel il faut faire attention. Dans le prologue aussi bien que dans l'épilogue de son livre l'auteur exige de conserver intégralement la tradition apostolique en s'opposant aux innovations, introduites par des ignorants[6]. Vu les controverses dans lesquelles Hippolyte s'était engagé[7] on comprend facilement à quel point il était important pour lui de ne pas donner son opinion particulière, mais de démontrer son accord avec les idées et les usages généralement partagés. En effet Hippolyte se montrait plein de respect pour la tradition. Grace à ce caractéristique son œuvre devient un témoignage qui dépasse les limites d'un manifeste personnel.

Attendu l'importance de cette «tradition apostolique» aussi bien que notre connaissance imparfaite de la nature et du développement de la vie chrétienne aux premiers siècles, la nécessité s'impose d'un examen scrupuleux des données de cet ordre ecclésiastique. Ce sont précisément des traits, à première vue peu importants, qui considerés dans un rapport plus large, peuvent nous intéresser. Voilà pourquoi, d'autres sources nous faisant défaut, il s'agit d'examiner avec une exactitude microscopique les quelques faits qui se présentent. Ensuite la question se pose de savoir dans quelle mesure il sera permis d'en tirer des «Rückschlüsse» et quelle lumière ces données jetteront sur des phases antérieures. Sans aucun doute M. Dix a dû examiner ce problème en éditant son commentaire sur cet ordre ecclésiastique qu'il a promis dans la préface de son excellente édition de 1937[8]. Pour autant que je sais ce commentaire n'a pas encore paru: il est vrai que l'incertitude actuelle sur la littérature anglaise pourra nous réserver quelque surprise. En attendant la réalisation de cette promesse l'article suivant examine de plus près un de ces traits, à savoir *le précepte qui fut donné aux femmes de défaire leurs cheveux et de se déparer de tous leurs bijoux avant d'être baptisées.*

2. Dans son introduction au rite de baptême Hippolyte mentionne l'ordre dans lequel les nouveaux membres de l'église doivent être baptisés. Après avoir ôté leurs habits, c'est d'abord le tour des petits enfants, ensuite des hommes adultes et finalement des femmes. Quant à ce dernier groupe, la prescription est conçue en ces termes: and last the women, who shall [all] have loosed their hair and laid aside the gold ornaments (κόσμησις) [*which they were wearing*]. Let no one go down to the water having any alien object (εἶδος ἀλλότριον) with 'them'.

Ainsi la reconstruction de M. Dix (p. 33); les mots entre [.....] peuvent s'appuyer sur quelques versions postérieures; il est probable qu'ils ne faisaient pas partie du texte original. La traduction latine manque à cet endroit. La prescription a été conservée dans la version copte-sahidique, arabe et éthiopienne de l'*Ordre Ecclésiastique Egyptien*, ainsi que dans la *Testamentum Domini* (*T.D.*) et les *Canones Hippolyti* (*C.H.*).

A cette indication succède la consécration de l'huile sainte pour les actions diverses; l'abjuration du diable; la première onction; la confession de foi et le baptême, suivi par une deuxième onction.

Sans aucun doute il s'agit ici d'*une prescription ancienne*. Plus tard cet usage n'est relaté nulle part, ni dans les informations ni dans les instructions concernant le rite du baptême. Il est vrai que Cyrille de Jérusalem[9] et Théodore de Mopsuestia[10] dans leur explication de la liturgie du baptême font mention du déshabillement qui précède au véritable baptême — ce qu'ils comparent au dépouillement du vieil Adam —, en vain on chercherait une indication spéciale pour les femmes. Comme les liturgies du baptême actuelles des églises orientales et occidentales supposent que plus tard on pratiqua presque exclusivement le baptême des enfants, il va de soi que désormais il ne saurait être question d'une pareille prescription.

Le problème se présente ainsi: quelle était la signification de cette indication? Avant de pouvoir trancher la question il faut d'abord savoir si l'action de défaire les cheveux et celle de se déparer de ses bijoux doivent être considérées comme une seule action ayant une même signification. Ou bien aurait-on affaire ici à deux rites distincts? Dans sa discussion au sujet des actions liées à l'exorcisme du baptême, F. J. Dölger les a traités ensemble. Il y voit surtout l'élément de l'exorcisme du diable. «Es herrschte also damals die Auffassung, es könnte sich im kleinsten Schmuck ein Dämon verstecken, welcher die Weihe illusorisch machen könnte». Il s'en rapporta à un passage curieux dans les *Excerpta e Theodoto*, où l'on prétend que parfois les mauvais esprits accompagnent la personne qu'on baptise dans l'eau[11]. D'accord avec Anrich, Dölger était convaincu qu'on visait dans la dite prescription des rites de lustration[12],

où s'ajoutait comme particularité chrétienne le fait qu'on considérait les bijoux comme une invention de mauvais esprits selon la doctrine du livre très estimé d'*Hénoch*[13].

Cette interprétation de l'explorateur génial dans le domaine de «Antike und Christentum» ne concerne au fond que l'action d'ôter les bijoux. Pour autant qu'elle s'y restreint, il se pourrait bien qu'elle soit juste, bien qu'il y ait encore d'autres possibilités (voir en bas p. 308). Cependant il ne parle pas séparément de l'action de défaire les cheveux. L'opinion qu'il s'agirait là de rites de lustration n'éclaircit guère le problème; sous ce titre Anrich[14] résumait toutes sortes d'usages d'origine et de temps différents. Dans son livre d'ailleurs plein de mérite ce savant n'a su échapper au danger de mêler des données de dates différentes pour obtenir une image tant soit peu complète, où l'examen critique fait défaut. En outre dans les textes qu'Anrich citait comme matière de comparaison les deux actions ne figuraient pas l'une à côté de l'autre; il a lui-même combiné des traits empruntés à des sources différentes. Ici encore la plus stricte réserve est de rigueur.

Il ne paraît pas juste de mettre ces deux actions de défaire les cheveux et d'ôter les bijoux sur le même plan, comme si l'une était la conséquence de l'autre. En parlant de bijoux il serait peu logique de supposer qu'on eût en vue exclusivement des épingles à cheveux, dont l'enlèvement aurait défait les cheveux. Evidemment il s'agit là également de boucles d'oreilles, de colliers, de bracelets et de bagues[15], tandis que l'action de défaire les cheveux a précédé. Ensuite la question n'est pas entamée de savoir quel rapport il pourrait y avoir entre ces usages et le baptême chrétien. Pourtant il doit y avoir un point de contact. Aurait-on donc affaire, à proprement parler, à de vieux usages romains qu'on a ajoutés plus tard au baptême, ou se pourrait-il que ce fussent de vieilles prescriptions liées au baptême dès le commencement?

En approfondissant ces questions il faut avant tout faire attention à ce que l'information d'Hippolyte est composée de deux parties de valeur différente. C'est qu'il donne en même temps un *double précepte*, et une *exhortation* à ce qui doit être évité. Supposé que l'interprétation de Dölger fût juste et qu'on visât par là l'exorcisme d'une influence démoniaque, cette exhortation proviendrait d'une certaine conception du rite par Hippolyte; cependant cela n'implique pas nécessairement qu'on a par là mis au jour la source et le véritable sens du rite. Les explications postérieures de la liturgie (la soi-disante *théologie mystagogique*; les *expositiones missae*) nous montrent qu'on a interprété la même action de façon différente et que sa signification variait selon l'époque. L'interprète donnait l'explication qui s'adaptait le mieux à son système théologique. L'action reste la même, mais l'interprétation qu'on en a donnée varie. Tout en étant pour

nous peut-être un moyen de connaître les idées d'Hippolyte, l'exhortation ne nous éclaircit pas sur l'origine; en outre elle ne se rapporte qu'à la deuxième partie et non pas à la première.

Il résulte de ces considérations qu'en examinant la valeur de cette donnée pour l'histoire du baptême, on fera bien *de ne pas perdre de vue l'action et de se rendre compte qu'elle est composée de deux parties différentes.*

3. Dans le même ordre d'idées la *comparaison des textes originaux* sur lesquels repose la reconstruction de M. Dix, nous porte à faire quelques remarques.

Dans le *texte copte-sahidique* avec lequel s'accordent presque exactement les textes arabes et éthiopiens[16], on lit dans le Canon 46: ..... last the women, who have all loosed their hair, and laid aside the gold and silver ornaments which they are wearing: let not any take any alien thing down to the water with them[17].

Des *Canones Hippolyti* il existe deux traductions modernes, différent l'une de l'autre dans un détail important pour notre étude. Le Canon 115 dans Achelis[18] prescrit: mulieres deponant ornamenta et aurea et caetera, solvant crinium nodos, ne cum illis descendat in aquam regenerationis quidquam peregrinum de spiritibus peregrinis. Riedel[19], au contraire, traduit ainsi (19, 7): Sie sollen ihren goldenen oder anderweitigen Schmuck ablegen, und ihr Haupthaar frei hängen lassen, damit mit ihnen kein fremdes Ding in das Wasser hinabsteige; kein böser Geist in das Wasser der Wiedergeburt.

Dans le *T.D.* II 8 l'ordre des actions, tel que nous le connaissons dans *l'Ordre Ecclésiastique Egyptien*, n'a pas été conservé, mais a été interrompu. Il commence, il est vrai, par l'énumération: petits enfants, hommes adultes et femmes, mais ensuite vient une prescription que les femmes qui se vouent à la virginité, doivent être baptisées les premières. Suit le renseignement, qui nous intéresse: que les femmes cependant, avant d'être baptisées, défassent leurs cheveux. Les parents doivent répondre pour les enfants qui ne savent parler eux-mêmes; l'évèque doit veiller à ce que personne d'entre eux — ni femme ni homme — ne porte quelque bijou en or, car il est défendu, quand on descend dans l'eau, de garder sur soi n'importe quel objet étrange[20].

Une comparaison de ces textes[21] montre que dans ce cas l'*Ordre Ecclésiastique Egyptien* a conservé le texte relativement le plus pur, où remontent le *C.H.* et le *T.D.* D'autre part un procès de changement qui aurait pris son point de départ, soit dans le *T.D.*, soit dans le *C.H.*, est inimaginable. Il est clair que dans les autres versions on a changé le texte en introduisant une glosse explicative et une inversion (*C.H.*) ou bien en ajoutant d'autres données (*T.D.*) qui trahissent nettement leur origine

postérieure. Dans le *C.H.* et le *T.D.* on donne deux interprétations différentes de la même action. Dans le *T.D.* les actions d'ôter les bijoux et de défaire les cheveux sont considérées comme deux actions isolées; le rapport avec «l'objet étrange» ne compte que pour les bijoux; d'autre part on était d'avis et à juste titre, qu'au fond cela devrait se rapporter également aux hommes. Dans le *C.H.* les deux actions sont considérées comme une seule (à remarquer le changement dans l'ordre: d'abord on se dépare des bijoux, puis on défait les cheveux!). Tout l'accent porte sur l'exorcisme des démons. Nous en aurions la preuve non seulement dans la remarque sur les mauvais esprits, mais surtout dans la traduction d'Achelis, supposé que celle-ci soit plus littérale que celle de Riedel — question que je ne saurais trancher —; car dans la traduction d'Achelis il est question de défaire les *noeuds* dans les cheveux et c'est un fait notoire qu'on attribua un effet magique aux noeuds et à l'action de les défaire[22].

Cette interprétation de *C.H.* était d'une signification décisive pour la conception de Dölger. Sans répéter la critique exprimée plus haut il importe de voir qu'on n'a pu arriver à cette interprétation qu'en forçant le texte par inversion (éventuellement en ajoutant les «noeuds»). Il est très bien possible que *C.H.* ait donné une bonne explication de «quelque chose d'étrange». Le mot «étrange», *alienus*, se trouve dans la *Traditio Apostolica* encore à un autre endroit, p.e. XXXII 4 *spiritus alienus*[23]. Cet emploi de «étrange», ἀλλότριος, dans les *Septante* (LXX) comme traduction de נכרי ou זר dans le sens de «hostile à Dieu», p.e. sur l'idolâtrie[24]. Cette nuance du mot se rencontre encore ailleurs, notamment en syrien[25]. Quand même Hippolyte aurait nourri l'idée que les bijoux étaient un support bien vu des démons (dans la suite de cet article il sera proposé une autre possibilité d'interprétation, voir p. 308), il ne s'agirait là que de l'action d'ôter les bijoux, et non de celle de défaire ses cheveux. Evidemment ce détail a embarrassé l'auteur de *C.H.*; voilà pourquoi il ne savait se tirer d'affaire qu'en changeant le texte.

Si en effet Hippolyte a nourri cette idée, il n'était pas le seul. Le livre d'*Hénoch* apprit — Dölger y appela l'attention et à bon droit — que les bijoux étaient une invention du diable. Tertullien partagea cette opinion, s'autorisant d'Hénoch[26]. Cependant je ne sache pas qu'on ait quelque part émis l'opinion que les cheveux relevés étaient particulièrement sujets aux influences démoniaques; au contraire les cheveux relevés passaient pour une coiffure très décente dans tous les cercles de la société antique (voir plus bas).

En interprétant ces préparations au baptême il faudra donc étudier séparément les deux actions ou bien se départir de l'explication qu'Hippolyte a peut-être voulu donner pour la seconde partie.

4. Il est nécessaire que quelques observations sur la coiffure antique, en particulier au commencement du troisième siècle[27], précèdent la discussion de cette donnée. Il va sans dire qu'il n'y avait pas de prescription spéciale pour les hommes, puisqu'ils avaient les cheveux coupés. Quant aux femmes la sculpture et les descriptions nous apprennent qu'au troisième siècle elles portaient en général les cheveux relevés. «Au IIIe siècle les femmes portent de larges et épais bandeaux aux ondes profondément creusées et qui descendent jusqu'au bas du cou; là ils se replient et se réunissent en une tresse aplatie sur la nuque; quelque-fois au contraire épaisse et lourde comme une sorte de large tourteau appliqué à la partie postérieure de la tête»[28]. Les Chrétiens suivaient la mode générale. Clément d'Alexandrie dans son *Pédagogue* conseillait à ses lectrices: ἀναδεῖσθαι τὴν κόμην εὐτελῶς περόνῃ τινὶ λιτῇ παρὰ τὸν αὐχένα[29]. Ses objections se tournaient contre les soins exagérés qu'on prodiguait à la coiffure; de même Tertullien fulminait contre «tanta ordinandi crinis operositas»[30]). Comme il paraît dans la suite de sa démonstration l'indignation de Tertullien ne concerne pas spécialement les cheveux relevés, mais également les cheveux flottants. Avec une lucidité qui de la part d'un ancien avocat et homme du monde ne saurait étonner, il juge cette coiffure si modeste en apparence extrêmement raffinée. L'intérêt exagéré qu'on portait à la coiffure manifeste le désir de plaire aux hommes et de les débaucher; voilà ce qui inquiétait les auteurs ecclésiastiques[31]. A cet égard ils restaient fidèles aux paroles des apôtres; lorsque dans 1 Timothée 2:9 et 1 Pierre 3:3 on avertit contre «la frisure» des cheveux, on y condamne sans aucun doute ce qu'il y avait là d'artificiel et d'exagéré, puisque c'était l'usage parmi les femmes juives d'avoir les cheveux longs, mais relevés[32].

Si dans le monde antique et parmi les chrétiens les femmes avaient donc l'habitude de relever les cheveux, *l'action de les défaire doit avoir été un rite particulier*. Les considérations suivantes font ressortir davantage ce caractère rituel. En général le baptême se fit par immersion[33]. Ç'aurait donc été bien plus simple de tenir les cheveux ensemble en mettant un capuchon, comme font les nageuses. Le baptême n'exige pas qu'on défasse les cheveux; le déshabillement seul est nécessaire. Evidemment le précepte d'Hippolyte ne sert qu'à compliquer les choses. Dans le Nouveau Testament il n'en est pas question.

Aurait-on affaire à une vieille cérémonie, datant de la première communauté palestinienne ou bien à une addition postérieure, qui fit ressortir davantage le caractère solennel du baptême? Dans le dernier cas il faudrait encore expliquer de quelle façon cet usage a pu être lié au baptême.

5. Dans le *culte grec* on rencontre à plusieurs endroits l'usage d'avoir les cheveux défaits dans certaines cérémonies. Dans sa thèse Schredelseker[34] fit observer que les Grecs avaient cet usage en commun avec d'autres peuples. Il attira notre attention sur les Vierges du Parthénon qui ont les cheveux flottants. Deux inscriptions prouvent que ce n'était pas un effet dû au hasard: dans le culte de Despoina à Lycosura εἰ δ' ἄν τις παρένθῃ ἔχων τι τῶν ἀ στάλα [x]ωλύει, ἀναθέτω ἐν τὸ ἱερόν: μηδὲ τὰς [τρί]χας ἀμπεπλεγμένας, μηδὲ κεκαλυμμένος et dans l'inscription bien connue sur les mystères à Andania μὴ ἐχέτω δὲ μηδεμία χρυσία μηδὲ φῦκος μηδὲ ψιμίθιον μηδὲ ἀνάδεμα μηδὲ τὰς τρίχας ἀνπεπλεγμένας[35]. Le motif ne manque pas de clarté: «nam nodi, ubicumque in religiones facientibus existerent, litationem irritam reddere putabantur, ut actio sacra vel magica eventu aut prorsus aut ex parte careret»[36].

Nous rencontrons le même usage dans les *mystères d'Isis*. Dans une élégie connue de Tibulle on lit:

> nunc, dea, nunc succurre mihi .....
> .....
> ut mea votivas persolvens Delia voces
> ante sacras lino tecta fores sedeat
> bisque die resoluta comas tibi dicere laudes
> insignis turba debeat in Pharia[37].

Ces vers sont confirmés par les images des mystères d'Isis[38], où les participants paraissent en effet les cheveux défaits[39].

La différence avec l'usage chrétien consiste en ce que chez les chrétiens on avait seulement les cheveux défaits pendant le baptême; nulle part nous ne constatons que les femmes doivent assister au culte les cheveux flottants. Dans les mystères gréco-helléniques un tel usage spécifique pendant le rite de baptême n'est mentionné nulle part. Les données, mentionnées ci-dessus, ne nous aident pas à résoudre le problème.

Plus tard dans l'église chrétienne les cheveux flottants se présentent quelquefois comme *signe de pénitence*[40], mais le plus souvent dans des cas pareils les cheveux furent coupés[41].

Quand on voit que *dans le monde romain* les cheveux flottants faisaient partie des *cérémonies de deuil*, il paraît que le problème touche à sa solution. Un passage curieux dans la *Passio Perpetuae* c. 20 montre que cet usage existait ainsi lors de la vie d'Hippolyte. Par suite de l'attaque d'une vache furieuse dans l'arène les cheveux de Perpetua se défaisaient. Elle s'empressait de les relever, à quoi on ajoutait cette explication: non enim decebat martyram sparsis capillis pati, ne in sua gloria (c.-à-d. le martyre, par où l'on gagna la béatitude céleste) plangere videretur[42]. Aux funérailles romaines il était d'usage qu'on se déparait de tous les

signes de sa dignité et de ses bijoux (selon Blümner cela concernait surtout les femmes) et que les parentes se joignaient au cortège les cheveux défaits[43]. Voici donc réunies les deux actions, citées par Hippolyte dans sa liturgie du baptême.

Si c'est juste, il faudra donc en conclure qu'ici un rite funéraire est lié au baptême. L'introduction de cet usage dans l'église chrétienne pourrait être motivée en référant à *l'Epître aux Romains* de Paul, ch. 6, où il dit que nous sommes ensevelis avec Jésus-Christ en sa mort par le baptême. Cependant cette explication se heurte à un double obstacle: 1) on n'a pas démontré que cet usage provient en effet du milieu romain. Ces cérémonies funèbres ne sont pas spécifiquement romaines, puisqu'on les rencontre dans toutes sortes de peuples. Bien que Krauss dans son *Talmudische Archäologie*[44] très détaillé ne mentionnât pas ce fait, Wensinck donnait plusieurs exemples de «neglect of the appearance» — parmi lesquels figurent également les cheveux flottants — des peuples sémitiques; en s'autorisant de l'ethnologue Wilken il citait des exemples de l'archipel indien où l'on observe les mêmes rites[45]. — 2) Supposé que l'action de défaire les cheveux et de se déparer des bijoux soient en effet des rites de deuil, pourquoi cela ne concernerait-il que les femmes et comment se fait-il que pour les hommes on cherche en vain quelque précepte faisant allusion à cet ensevelissement avec Jésus Christ. Reste à savoir de quelle façon ces usages furent liés au baptême.

6. Avant de recourir au cérémonies mentionnées ci-dessus il est nécessaire d'examiner de plus près *les cérémonies qu'observaient les Juifs pour le baptême ou l'ablution*. C'est un fait généralement connu que chez les Juifs les baptêmes abondaient dans toutes sortes de circonstances[46]. L'erreur méthodique commise par l'examen historique des sacrements fut de rechercher presque exclusivement les données non-juives. Pour le baptême on consacrait quelques remarques au baptême des prosélytes sans étudier à fond les données en se plaçant au point de vue juif. Pourtant on ne saurait nier que le plus vieux christianisme est enraciné dans un entourage juif et qu'il lui en est resté beaucoup de traces. La nature des rapports entre le judaisme, le christianisme et l'hellénisme (orientalisme) est loin d'être connue dans tous ses détails; certainement le problème du «Hellenisierung des Christentums» n'est pas aussi simple qu'on se plaît quelquefois à le présenter. S'il règne une grande incertitude sur le rapport entre le baptême juif, notamment le baptême des prosélytes, et le baptême chrétien quant au sens, c'est un fait avéré que pour la forme le christianisme s'est affilié au rites juifs[47]. Notre examen porte sur une pareille question formelle. Serait-il possible de marquer ici quelque rapport?

Jusqu'à présent on n'a pas étudié les données juives avec cette attention minutieuse qu'elles méritaient. Dans le livre de Brandt bien des questions ne sont pas discutées. La discussion entre C. F. Rogers et I. Abrahams, intitulée: «How did the Jews baptize?» posait seulement le problème de savoir si chez les Juifs celui qu'on baptise était immergé complètement ou seulement jusqu'au cou. Abrahams qui soutenait (à bon droit à ce que je crois) la première hypothèse, avouait qu'il aurait aimé à discuter encore d'autres problèmes annexes[48]. Ce qui rend un étude sur ce sujet extrêmement difficile, c'est que les rabbins n'ont pas traité cette matière d'une façon systématique. Les données très répandues doivent être rassemblées en comparant les différents textes tandis qu'à plusieurs reprises — comme nous verrons — une remarque purement fortuite nous fait connaître la cérémonie observée. Dans cet article c'est uniquement la préparation des femmes qui nous occupe. Il ne saurait être question ici du problème de l'origine du baptême des prosélytes. Nous nous rangeons du côté de ceux qui défendent l'existence du baptême des prosélytes à l'époque du Nouveau Testament.

Il est de la dernière importance de savoir que selon la tradition des rabbins on a les mêmes préceptes pour le baptême des prosélytes que pour la lustration d'une femme après la menstruation. Plus loin nous verrons pourquoi il en était ainsi. En tout cas on peut supposer que ce qui était fixé pour la «nidda» — la femme pendant la menstruation — l'était également pour le baptême des prosélytes. Dans *Talmud Babli Jebamoth* fol. 47b on lit le précepte suivant: Wo eine Menstruierende untertaucht (c.-à-d. dans un bain pour lequel il faut 40 seah d'eau), tauchen auch der Proselyt und der freigelassene Sklave unter, und alles, was beim Untertauchen als Trennung gilt, gilt auch beim Proselyten, dem freigelassenen Sklaven und der Menstruierenden als Trennung[49].

Dans le passage cité on se sert du mot «séparation» (חציצה)[50]. Dans les préceptes pour le baptême il en est question tout le temps. Pour que le baptême fût légitime, il ne devait pas y avoir de «séparation»; l'eau devait toucher le corps tout entier sans rencontrer aucun obstacle. Dans le traité *Miqwaoth* tout un chapitre est consacré à la question de savoir ce qui doit être considéré comme «séparation» pour les hommes et pour les objets[51]. Nous y lisons e.a.: Folgendes gilt beim Menschen als Trennung: Wollfäden, Flachsfäden und Bänder am Kopfe der Mädchen. Plus tard on a voulu faire une exception pour des bandeaux en laine etc. parce que l'eau peut y pénétrer. A comparer Michna *Shabbat* VI 1 et l'explication annexe dans le Gemara. Là on énumère ce qu'il est défendu aux femmes de porter le jour de sabbat; il est vrai que les motifs ne sont pas clairs[52]. Ce sont les mêmes objets que dans *Miqwaoth* et on ajoute expressément: sie darf damit kein Reinigungsbad nehmen, ohne sie gelöst zu haben. Dans la

suite aucun bijou n'échappera à cette loi[53]. Tout ce qui ne fait pas partie du corps, devra être déposé pour que l'eau puisse toucher le corps entier.

Le fait que les femmes devaient enlever leurs bandeaux implique qu'elles avaient les cheveux défaits. A ce sujet aucun doute ne saurait subsister, comme le prouve une tradition de *Baba Qamma* fol 82 a-b, où l'on cite comme tradition d'Ezra (certainement un précepte très ancien): Dass eine Frau sich vorher kamme und erst dann bade. Dies befindet sich ja in der Tora!? Es wird nämlich gelehrt (Lev. 15:16): *er soll den Leib im Wasser baden*, nichts darf den Leib vom Wasser trennen; *den Leib*, das, was zum Leibe gehört, das ist nämlich das Haar. — Ich will dir sagen, nach der Tora ist nur zu beobachten, dass nicht (Haare) zusammengeknotet bleiben, oder dass nicht (eine Stelle) beschmutzt sei, was als Trennung gilt, er aber kam und ordnete auch das Kämmen an[54]. La même chose est impliquée dans la décision de *Miqwaoth* VIII 5: si une femme mettait ses cheveux dans sa bouche, le baptême n'était pas légitime[55]; il est évident que le geste ne pourrait se faire qu'au cas où les cheveux seraient défaits. Selon Büchler la situation était ainsi: «Das lange Haar trug die Frau bedeckt und zwar derart, dass es auf dem Kopfe zusammengebunden oder gerollt war; darüber lag ein Tuch oder eine Mütze ..... Nam die Frau ihre Kopfbedeckung ab, so fiel das Haar frei auf den Rücken»[56].

Il résulte des passages cités que chez les Juifs c'était l'habitude que les femmes aux lustrations après la menstruation, auxquelles on égalait le baptême des prosélytes, devaient défaire les cheveux et déposer les bijoux et les bandeaux, juste comme dans l'Ordre Ecclésiastique d'Hippolyte. A ce point de vue il est très bien possible qu'Hippolyte par «objet étrange» n'ait pas voulu dire: quelque chose de satanique, mais tout simplement: une chose qui ne faisait pas partie du corps («séparation» חציצה). Dans ce cas l'addition: let no one go down to the water having any alien object with them, ne servirait donc pas à expliquer ce qui précède, mais serait un précepte d'une tendance plus générale; dans ce qui précède il s'agit uniquement des bijoux en or qu'il faut déposer; il faut en faire de même avec tout le reste des accessoires.

L'accord entre les usages dont témoigne le Talmud et ceux qui selon l'Ordre Ecclésiastique d'Hippolyte furent observés à Rome, ne saurait être expliqué que par leur origine commune. Tous deux remontent à la même source: la pratique des bains lustraux de Palestine. Il est vrai que cette pratique n'est mentionnée que beaucoup plus tard; vu la ténacité avec laquelle de pareils rites se maintiennent en Orient, cela ne saurait rien prouver contre l'ancienneté du phénomène. Vu l'état fragmentaire de la tradition l'*argumentum e silentio* ne tient pas debout. Comme elle l'a fait pour tant d'autres actions et de prières liturgiques l'église primitive s'est affiliée dans ce cas encore aux rites qu'elle trouvait chez les Juifs[57]. D'autre part le rapport entre les

Juifs et les Chrétiens rend impossible toute influence à une date postérieure dans n'importe quelle direction.

7. C'est sur *l'origine et la signification de ces actes chez les Juifs* qu'on tâtonne toujours.

a. Quant à l'origine l'accord entre les usages des Juifs postérieurs et les Chrétiens prouve — de pareils actes étant presque toujours respectés et sauvegardés entièrement même s'ils ne sont pas compris — que ces usages doivent avoir existé dès l'époque du Nouveau Testament. Mais nous ignorons depuis combien d'années ils existaient déjà. La Loi indique qu'une femme pendant la menstruation est impure (Lev. 15:19 ss.) et qu'après son isolement le prêtre sacrifiera deux tourterelles ou deux pigeonneaux, l'un en offrande pour le péché et l'autre en holocauste, mais il n'est pas question d'un bain. Vu le caractère fragmentaire de la législation de l'Ancien Testament, il n'y a là rien d'étonnant; cela ne prouve pas non plus que le bain de purification dès lors n'aurait pas existé. Brandt y voit, soit une grande négligence de la part de l'auteur, soit une ancienne mutilation fortuite du texte. «Auch hat die jüdische Frau von jeher nach der Menstruation sich durch Waschen oder Baden gereinigt»[58]. Il se pourrait aussi qu'on ait omis le précepte parce qu'on supposait que la femme prît un bain tout comme les hommes pour qui on venait de donner le précepte (Lev. 15:4 ss.). Cependant il est impossible de fixer si l'on a affaire ici à un rite antique.

b. Quant à la signification, les rabbins affirment qu'on devait se défaire de tout ce qui ne faisait pas partie du corps, parce que l'eau baptismale devait pouvoir toucher le corps entier. On ne saurait ni révoquer en doute cette explication ni la rejeter comme étant trop rationnelle.

Evidemment il faut chercher ailleurs la raison pour laquelle on défaisait les cheveux. Cet usage est cité à plusieurs reprises dans l'Ancien Testament: comme usage de funérailles, pour les lépreux et les guerriers, pour des femmes soupçonnées d'adultère[59]. On n'a pas encore abouti à des résultats définitifs sur l'origine et la signification du rite. Comme nous l'avons déjà vu plus haut ces questions ne sauraient être traitées que dans un étude s'étendant sur plusieurs religions et plusieurs peuples. Il nous est impossible de pousser nos études aussi loin, vu le caractère de cet article. Il suffit d'avoir démontré que l'usage était connu dans Israel, et de savoir quelle était là la signification. Il nous semble que M. Eerdmans montre la bonne direction en faisant remarquer: «Quiconque les voyait pouvait voir qu'ils subissaient une influence spéciale»[60]. Ils vivaient en marge de l'ordre normal, sacré; voilà pourquoi ils furent estimés «impurs». Plus tard le mot פרע = porter les cheveux flottants était le plus souvent interprété de la sorte: se découvrir, comme il resulte de la

terminologie rabbinique et des Septante[61]. Mais pour les femmes l'action de découvrir la tête ne consistait pas seulement à enlever le serre-tête[62], mais aussi à faire tomber les cheveux relevés (à voir le remarque de Büchler, cité ci-dessus). La définition, donnée dans le Talmud au sujet des préceptes dans Num. 5:18 nous le montre clairement ainsi que le contraste: une tête couverte = une tête dont les cheveux étaient relevés[63]. *Les cheveux flottants indiquaient donc que la femme était impure*[64].

Selon la loi de Lev. 15:19 ss. les femmes étaient impures pendant la menstruation; il était tout à fait conforme au raisonnement par analogie des Juifs de croire que pour elles également ces usages étaient de rigueur.

La même chose s'appliquait aux paiens. Les Juifs les indiquaient tout court comme des «impurs»; leurs femmes étaient estimées souillées par la menstruation; leur pays était impur[65]. Ce cours d'idées se rencontrait sans aucun doute à l'époque du Nouveau Testament, comme il resulte des Acta Apostolorum 10:28: ὑμεῖς ἐπίστασθε ὡς ἀθέμιτόν ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ Ἰουδαίῳ κολλᾶσθαι ἢ προσέρχεσθαι ἀλλοφύλῳ· κἀμοὶ ὁ θεὸς ἔδειξεν μηδένα κοινὸν ἢ ἀκάθαρτον λέγειν ἄνθρωπον. Voilà pourquoi les paiens en devenant Juifs, devaient également prendre un bain de purification[66], comme la femme après la menstruation. Il va de soi que le rite dans les deux cas était le même. Pour la façon orientale d'argumenter l'un s'ensuit de l'autre.

L'action de défaire les cheveux signalait donc l'impureté des païennes. Après ce qui se fut passé dans la maison de Corneille (Act. 10) et la lutte de l'apôtre Paul contre la validité de la loi juive pour l'église de Jésus Christ, cette distinction entre «pur et impur» eut perdu sa raison d'être. Mais une autre distinction qui y fut parallèle, était généralement répandue parmi les Juifs, à savoir que le paganisme se laissait influencer par le diable et ses démons, puisque les paiens sacrifiaient aux idoles[67]. Parfois on appelait les démons des esprits impurs[68]. Les Chrétiens ont maintenu et continué cette tradition[69]. *Par l'idée commune d'impureté le vieux rite juif du baptême pouvait ainsi être conservé.* Les paiens étant influencés par les esprits impurs devaient d'abord en être délivrés. Cela s'exécuta par l'exorcisme, qui au contraire ne fut jamais pratiqué, lorsqu'un Juif se convertit[70]. Alors on fit ses adieux à Satan et à son service (ce service ne consistait pas uniquement en idolâtrie, mais également en jeux de theâtre etc.)[71] et la prière qui accompagna l'onction fut conçue en ces termes: Let all evil spirits depart far from thee[72].

Vu sous ce jour il devient clair pourquoi plus tard il n'est plus question de cet usage de défaire les cheveux. C'est qu'en comparant l'ordre des actes baptismaux de Cyrille de Jérusalem et de Théodore de Mopsuestia

à celui d'Hippolyte, on se rend compte qu'au 4me siècle le déshabillement n'eut lieu qu'après l'exorcisme, tandis que dans Hippolyte il y précédait. En effet plus tard il n'était plus nécessaire de souligner expressément l'impureté par l'action de défaire les cheveux, cette impureté étant déjà enlevée par l'exorcisme. Pour autant que je sais cet usage ne s'est conservé que dans les descendants de l'*Ordre Ecclésiastique* d'Hippolyte; ce serait le sujet d'une étude intéressante que de découvrir s'il en existe encore d'autres traces ailleurs.

8. *Conclusion:* a. Dans l'antiquité l'usage parmi les Juifs voulait que ce fût un signe d'impureté que de porter les cheveux défaits. De même la menstruation et le paganisme furent considérés comme une impureté. Il fallait que les femmes qui devaient se purifier en prenant un bain, défissent d'abord leurs cheveux; en outre elles devaient avoir soin que n'importe quel objet ne faisant pas partie du corps, ne pût empêcher l'eau de mouiller le corps entier.

b. L'église primitive a conservé cet usage en rapport avec le baptême. Il est vrai que cet usage n'est pas cité dans les sources les plus anciennes, mais l'accord entre les sources juives et l'*Ordre Ecclésiastique* d'Hippolyte, référant tous les deux à la Palestine comme à la patrie commune, en assure l'existence.

c. A cet égard encore l'*Ordre Ecclésiastique* d'Hippolyte prouve son caractère traditionel. Toutes les données que nous avons examinées se font expliquer d'une façon naturelle en tenant compte de la religion juive. Voilà pourquoi on ne peut pas — comme fit Anrich — rallier cet usage aux usages dont il n'est question que beaucoup plus tard. Il faut fixer de cas en cas ce qui correspond aux usages juifs, aux rites des mystères. L'accord avec les usages hellénistes n'est donc pas direct, mais indirect; les Juifs de l'Ancien Testament connaissaient des usages correspondant aux usages grecs et romains. Lorsque le christianisme a paru dans le monde helléniste avec son héritage juif, les accords émergeaient. A mon avis il paraîtra de plus en plus clair que la grande influence des religions des mystères sur l'église chrétienne se fait valoir *après* l'époque d'Hippolyte.

d. Par rapport à ce passage du rite baptismal notre examen confirme l'opinion de M. Dix que «the baptismal rite (of Hippolytus) is derived directly from the baptismal rite for Jewish proselytes»[73].

9. Bien que cela ne présente pas un rapport direct avec le rite baptismal, je voudrais terminer cet article par la discussion d'un passage de la littérature chrétienne primitive, où il est question de femmes, qui ont les cheveux flottants, c.-à-d. dans le *Pastor Hermae, Similitudo* IX. Il n'était pas

possible de mettre en cause ce passage auparavant, Hermas mentionnant le fait, sans en donner une explication.

Dans *Sim.* IX 9:5 on lit: ἐκλήθησαν δὲ γυναῖκες δώδεκα εὐειδέσταται τῷ χαρακτῆρι, μέλανα ἐνδεδυμέναι, περιεζωσμέναι καὶ ἔξω τοὺς ὤμους ἔχουσαι, καὶ τὰς τρίχας λελυμέναι. ἐδοκοῦσαν δέ μοι αἱ γυναῖκες αὗται ἄγριαι εἶναι. ἐκέλευσε δὲ αὐτὰς ὁ ποιμὴν ἆραι τοὺς λίθους τοὺς ἀποβεβλημένους ἐκ τῆς οἰκοδομῆς, καὶ ἀπενεγκεῖν αὐτοὺς εἰς τὰ ὄρη ὅθεν καὶ ἠνέχθησαν[74]. Dans IX 9:6 Hermas ajoute encore: αἱ δὲ ἵλαραὶ ἦραν, καὶ ἀπήνεγκαν πάντας τοὺς λίθους[75]. Dans IX 13:6-9 on donne une explication de ces pierres rejetées. On veut parler de ces hommes qui ont été Chrétiens pendant quelque temps menant une vie chrétienne, mais qui bientôt ont été séduits par ces femmes (ἀνεπείσθησαν). Ils sont ἀπατηθέντες τῷ κάλλει τῶν γυναικῶν τούτων. Ces femmes sont le contraire de παρθένοι, qui figurent comme des servantes de Dieu. Dans 15 on énumère les noms des vierges et des femmes. Les vierges s'appellent: Foi, Abstinence, Force, Patience, Dureté, Innocence, Chasteté, Joie, Vérité, Intelligence, Harmonie, Amour; celui qui porte ces noms et le nom du Fils de Dieu peut entrer dans le royaume de Dieu. Par contre on lit dans 15:3: ἡ πρώτη Ἀπιστία, ἡ δευτέρα Ἀκρασία, ἡ δὲ τρίτη Ἀπείθεια, ἡ δὲ τετάρτη Ἀπάτη. αἱ δὲ ἀκόλουθοι αὐτῶν καλοῦνται Λύπη, Πονηρία, Ἀσέλγεια, Ὀξυχολία, Ψεῦδος, Ἀφροσύνη, Καταλαλιά, Μῖσος. ταῦτα τὰ ὀνόματα ὁ φορῶν τοῦ θεοῦ δοῦλος τὴν βασιλείαν μὲν ὄψεται τοῦ θεοῦ, εἰς αὐτὴν δὲ οὐκ εἰσελεύσεται[76]. Chez Hermas ce sont donc les vices, mais il n'explique pas leur apparence; seulement elles faisaient sur lui une impression sauvage. Dibelius dans son commentaire ne sait guère mieux comment s'y prendre; il dit que cela se fait remarquer, «dass das Äussere dieser Weiber so gar nicht ihre lasterhafte Art verrät» et il suppose que Hermas emploie ici — comme il a fait si souvent — des images empruntées, qui à l'origine avaient une autre signification[77]. Pourtant Büchler avait montré dès 1905 la bonne voie; il établit un rapport entre l'action (mentionnée plus haut) de défaire les cheveux chez une femme soupçonnée d'adultère (Num. 5:18; *Talmud Sota*, fol. 8a-9b). Selon lui c'était signe de débauche; dans Hermas on cite les mêmes signes que dans le *Talmud Gittin*, fol. 90b[78]: un homme dont la femme se conduit ainsi doit la chasser[79]. Cependant il ne faut pas penser exclusivement à la débauche, bien que par leur beauté ce soient des séductrices qui s'opposent aux «vierges». Leurs vêtements noirs indiquent par opposition au blanc qui est la couleur divine, le caractère diabolique[80]; leurs cheveux flottants accentuent l'impureté. Leur apparence montre qu'ils n'appartiennent pas à l'ordre divin, voilà pourquoi celui qui les fréquente, ne fera pas partie du royaume de Dieu. Chez Hermas ces esprits impurs sont «umgedeutet» dans le sens moral, mais leur vraie nature se montre clairement dans leurs vêtements. On ne saurait être fixé sur l'origine de

cette image chez Hermas. En tout cas elle se marie bien avec la conception sur les cheveux défaits que nous nous sommes permis de soumettre à votre jugement.

NOTES

* Paru dans: *Vigiliae Christianae* 1 (1947), p. 77-100.

[1] A voir pour la date: B. Altaner, *Patrologie*, Freiburg i. Br. 1938, pp. 25-26; G. Dix, *The Treatise on the Apostolic Tradition of St. Hippolytus of Rome*, t. London 1937, p. xxxv-xxxvii.

[2] R. Lorentz, *De Egyptische Kerkenordening en Hippolytus van Rome*, Haarlem 1929; cf. H. Elfers, *Die Kirchenordnung Hippolyts von Rom*, Paderborn 1938.

[3] R. H. Connolly, *The so-called Egyptian Church-Order and derived Documents* (Texts and Studies VIII 4), Cambridge 1916, p. 149.

[4] Iuvenalis, *Satira* III 62 *Iam pridem Syrus in Tiberim defluxit Orontes* etc.

[5] A. von Harnack, *Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christentums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten*[4], Leipzig 1924, pp. 798-810.

[6] *Traditio Apostolica*, ed. Dix, p. 2 et 71.

[7] Dix, l.c., p. xii-xxviii. A la page xxxviii-xliv M. Dix parle de «the representative value of the evidence of *Apostolic Tradition*».

[8] Dix, l.c., p. x et xxxvii.

[9] Cyrillus Hieros., *Catechesis Mystagogica* II 2, ed. J. Rupp, München 1860, p. 356.

[10] Theodorus Mops., *Liber ad Baptizandos*, ed. A. Mingana, Cambridge 1933, t. II, p. 54.

[11] *Excerpta e Theodoto* 83, ed. O. Stählin, *Klemens Alexandrinus*, t. III, Leipzig 1909, p. 133: ἐπὶ τὸ βάπτισμα χαίροντας ἔρχεσθαι προσῆκεν· ἀλλ' ἐπεὶ πολλάκις συγκαταβαίνει τισὶ καὶ ἀκάθαρτα πνεύματα παρακολουθοῦντα, καὶ τυχόντα μετὰ τοῦ ἀνθρώπου τῆς σφραγῖδος ἀνίατα τοῦ λοιποῦ γίνεται, ἃ τῇ χαρᾷ συμπλέκεται φόβος, ἵνα τις μόνος καθαρὸς αὐτὸς κατέλθῃ.

[12] G. Anrich, *Das antike Mysterienwesen in seinem Einfluss auf das Christentum*, Göttingen 1894, p. 201-204.

[13] F. J. Dölger, *Der Exorcismus im altchristlichen Taufritual*, Paderborn 1909, p. 112-114. — Le texte d'*Hénoch* est conçu en ces termes (ed. H. B. Swete, *The Old Testament in Greek*[3], Cambridge 1905, t. III, p. 793): ἐδίδαξεν τοὺς ἀνθρώπους Ἀζαὴλ μαχαίρας ποιεῖν καὶ ὅπλα καὶ ἀσπίδας καὶ θώρακας, διδάγματα ἀγγέλων καὶ ὑπέδειξεν αὐτοῖς τὰ μέταλλα καὶ τὴν ἐργασίαν αὐτῶν, καὶ ψέλια καὶ κόσμους καὶ στίβεις καὶ τὸ καλλιβλέφαρον καὶ παντοίους λίθους ἐκλέκτους καὶ τὰ βαφικά.

[14] Anrich, op. cit., p. 202-204.

[15] Tertullianus, *De cultu feminarum*, I 9, ed. W. Kok, Dokkum 1934, p. 56.

[16] G. Horner, *The Statutes of the Apostles*, London 1904: éthiopien, can. 35, p. 152-153; arabe, can. 34, p. 253.

[17] G. Horner, l.c., p. 316.

[18] H. Achelis, *Die ältesten Quellen des orientalischen Kirchenrechts*, Leipzig 1891, t. I, p. 94; cette traduction s'appuie sur des manuscripts postérieurs à ceux dont se sert Riedel (n. 19).

[19] W. Riedel, *Die Kirchenrechtsquellen des Patriarchats von Alexandrien*, Leipzig 1900, p. 211.

[20] *Testamentum Domini nostri Jesu Christi*, ed. I. E. Rahmani, Maine 1899, p. 126.

[21] A voir au sujet de la nature de la tradition et de l'appréciation des sources très variées le résumé très net de M. Dix, l.c., p. lii-lxxxi.

[22] A voir le remarque de B. D. Eerdmans, *De Godsdienst van Israël*, Assen 1930, t. II, p. 114, à propos de Daniël 5:12; prendre dans un sens strictement littéral les mots: résoudre les noeuds, et ne pas traduire: résoudre les questions difficiles. — La note importante de C. Kayser, *Die Canones Jacob's von Edessa*, Leipzig 1886, p. 130-131 nous apprend que la foi dans la force magique des noeuds était très répandue en Orient; cf. J. Hempel, dans:

Die Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart[2], t. III, Tübingen 1929, col. 1107-1108, s.v. 'Knoten', et: E. Samter, *Geburt, Hochzeit, Tod*, Leipzig 1911, p. 121-130.

[23] Dix, l.c., p. 59: *quapropter nolite effundere* (c.-à-d. le chalice) *ut non s̄p̄s alienus uelut te contemnente illut delingat.*

[24] Cf. J. Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus ... sive Lexicon in LXX...*, Leipzig 1820, t. I, p. 162-163. — Le Nouveau Testament ignore le mot dans le sens-là.

[25] W. C. van Unnik, *Nestorian Questions on the Administration of the Eucharist*, Haarlem 1937, p. 213.

[26] Tertullianus, *De cultu feminarum* I 2-3, ed. Kok, p. 38-40.

[27] E. Pottier, M. Albert, E. Saglio, dans: Ch. Daremberg-E. Saglio, *Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines*, Paris 1887, tom. I 2, p. 1367-1371, s.v. 'coma'; H. Blümner, *Die römischen Privataltertümer*[3], München 1911, p. 272 ff.; H. Leclercq, dans: F. Cabrol-H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie* 1912, t. III 1, col. 1307-1320, s.v. 'chevelure'.

[28] E. Pottier, M. Albert, E. Saglio, l.c., p. 1369.

[29] Clemens Alex., *Paedagogus* III 62, 2, ed. O. Stählin, t. I[2], p. 271.

[30] Tertullianus, *De cultu feminarum* II 7, ed. Kok, p. 78.

[31] Cf. *Didascalia Apostolorum* c. 3, ed. R. H. Connolly, Oxford 1929, p. 23 et les passages cités de Clément et de Tertullien.

[32] S. Krauss, *Talmudische Archäologie*, Leipzig 1910, t. I, p. 194-195.

[33] Cf. W. Smith-S. Cheetham, *Dictionary of Christian Antiquities*, London 1875, t. I, p. 161.

[34] P. Schredelseker, *De superstitionibus Graecorum quae ad crines pertinent*, thèse — Heidelberg 1913, p. 63-64; E. Samter, op. cit., p. 114-115, 124, cf. A. Bertholet, dans: *R.G.G.*[2], Tübingen 1928, t. II, col. 1554, s.v. 'Haar': «vielfach verlangen rituelle Handlungen offenes Haar — schon zur Vermeidung des Knotens».

[35] W. Dittenberger, *Sylloge Inscriptionum Graecarum*[3], t. III, tit. 999 (Lycosura) et t. II, tit. 736 (Andania).

[36] Schredelseker, op. cit., p. 64.

[37] Tibullus, *Elegia* I 3 27-32.

[38] Cf. J. Leipoldt, *Die Religionen in der Umwelt des Urchristentums*, dans: H. Haas, *Atlas der Religionsgeschichte*, Lief. 9-11, Leipzig 1926, fig. 50, 53, 54, 56.

[39] Obscur en plusieurs égards est Callimaque, *Hymne à Déméter 5*, dans *Callimachi Hymni et Epigrammata*[4], ed. U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorf, Berlin 1925, p. 43: „..... μηδ' ἃ κατεχεύατο χαίταν."

[40] Cf. Smith-Cheetham, l.c., t. I, p. 756, en citant Hieronymus, *Epistula* 30, al. 84 *ad Oceanum.*

[41] Smith-Cheetham, l.c., mentionnent à ce sujet plusieurs passages, mais tous postérieurs au 3me siècle.

[42] C. J. M. J. van Beek, *Passio Sanctarum Perpetuae et Felicitatis*, Nijmegen 1936, t. I, p. 48.

[43] H. Blümner, op. cit., p. 497.

[44] S. Krauss, op. cit., t. II, Leipzig 1911, p. 71.

[45] A. J. Wensinck, *Some Semitic Rites of Mourning and Religion*, Amsterdam 1917, p. 50-51.

[46] W. Brandt, *Die jüdischen Baptismen oder das religiöse Waschen und Baden im Judentum*, Giessen 1910 y voua une monographie. — Il ne faut pas perdre de vue que notre distinction entre un bain d'ablution et le sacrement du baptême n'existait pas pour les Orientaux. βάπτισμα et βαπτισμός s'appliquaient indifféremment à tous les deux; ils faisaient partie de la même catégorie; l'argumentation dans *Didascalia Apostolorum* 26 le prouve clairement.

[47] A voir pour cette question le compte-rendu de Ch. de Beus, *De oudchristelijke doop en zijn voorgeschiedenis*, tome I, Haarlem 1945.

[48] C. F. Rogers, 'How did the Jews baptize?', dans: *Journal of Theological Studies* xii (1911), p. 437-445. — I. Abrahams, 'How did the Jews baptize?', dans: *J. Th. St.* xii, p. 609-612.

[49] Le Talmud est cité dans la traduction de L. Goldschmidt, *Der babylonische Talmud*, Berlin 1931, t. IV, p. 474, en la comparant au texte original.

[50] J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*[2], Berlin-Wien 1924, t. II, p. 100.

[51] *Miqwaoth* IX dans: Goldschmidt, op. cit., t. XII, p. 799. — Cf. l'histoire de *Jebamoth* fol. 46a, dans: Goldschmidt, op. cit., t. IV, p. 468: un esclave veut devenir prosélyte; en le baptisant ,,da legten sie ihm eine Kette um den Hals, die sie lose hielten und festzogen. Lose hielten, damit keine Trennung entstehe, und festzogen, damit er nicht zuvorkomme und sage, er tauche zwecks Freiwerdung unter. Als er den Kopf aus dem Wasser hob, legten sie ihm ein Gefäss mit Lehm auf dem Kopf und sprachen zu ihm: Geh, bring es deinem Herrn.''

[52] Cf. W. Nowack, 'Schabbat', dans: *Die Mischna*, Giessen 1924, p. 57.

[53] Dans: Goldschmidt, op. cit., t. I, p. 603.

[54] Dans: Goldschmidt, op. cit., t. VII, p. 276-277.

[55] Dans: Goldschmidt, op. cit., t. XII, p. 798. — Il paraît que les noeuds dans les cheveux constituaient une ,,séparation'', voir la discussion dans: *Nidda* fol. 67b, dans: Goldschmidt, op. cit., t. XII, p. 570: Rabba b. R. Hona sagte: Ein geknotetes Haar gilt als ein Trennendes, drei gilten nicht als Trennendes; von zweien weiss ich es nicht. R. Johanan sagte: Wir wissen nur eines: R. Jiçhaq sagte: Nach der Tora gilt der grössere Teil, wenn man darauf achtet, als Trennendes, und wenn man nicht darauf achtet, nicht als Trennendes, jedoch haben sie es beim grösseren Teile angeordnet, auch wenn man darauf nicht achtet, wegen des grösseren Teiles, wenn man darauf achtet; ainsi pour la partie la plus petite. — Cette discussion date du 2me partie de la 3me siècle (pour les noms des rabbins voir H. L. Strack, *Einleitung in Talmud und Midrasch*[5], München 1922, p. 137, 138, 143).

[56] A. Büchler, 'Das Schneiden des Haares als Strafe der Ehebrecher bei den Semiten', dans: *Wiener Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes* XIX (1905), p. 93, n. 1 sur p. 94.

[57] Cf. A. Baumstark, *Vom geschichtlichen Werden der Liturgie*[1-5], *Freiburg i. Br. 1923, p. 13-21.*

[58] W. Brandt, op. cit., p. 21.

[59] Lév. 10:6, 21:10, 13:45, Num. 5:18, 6:5, Jud. 5:2 (?), Ezéch. 44:20, cf. W. Gesenius-F. Buhl, *Handwörterbuch über das Alte Testament*[17], Leipzig 1921, p. 660, s.v. פרע; B. D. Eerdmans, op. cit., t. I, p. 135-136.

[60] B. D. Eerdmans, op. cit., t. I, p. 136. — J. C. Matthes, 'Twee Rouwgebruiken', dans: *Een Bundel, Verzamelde Opstellen*, Haarlem 1913, p. 94-97, le considérait exclusivement comme un usage de deuil, ce qui nous paraît injuste, car il faut chercher une explication convenant à tous les cas. Matthes donne aussi quelques autres explications et il insiste sur la difficulté née de cet usage comparé à celui de se couper les cheveux.

[61] LXX: Lév. 10:6 et 21:10 ἀποκιδαρόω = litt. ôter un bonnet persan; 13:45 ἀκατακάλυπτος; Num. 5:18 ἀποκαλύψει τὴν κεφαλήν; 6:5 κόμη; Jud. 5:2 ἀπεκαλύφθη ἀποκάλυμμα; Ezéch. 44:20 τὰς κόμας αὐτῶν οὐ ψιλώσουσιν (d'après l'édition de Swete). — Pour la terminologie rabbinique voir H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrash*, München 1926, t. III, p. 433-434; S. Krauss, op. cit., t. I, p. 651-652; J. Levy, op. cit., t. IV, p. 127-129. — Une étude approfondie du mot פרע s'impose.

[62] Cf. la reproduction de Num. 5:18 par Josephus, *Antiquitates Judaicae* III 11, 6, ed. S. A. Naber, Leipzig 1888, t. I, p. 190.

[63] Voir *Sota* fol. 8*b*-9*a*, dans: Goldschmidt, op. cit., t. VI, p. 28; S. Krauss, op. cit., t. I, p. 650.

[64] Au cas de Num. 5:18 l'action de défaire les cheveux était sentie comme un signe de honte selon les sources rabbiniques, mais il faut que ce soit une explication postérieure, puisqu'elle ne jette aucune lumière sur les autres passages.

[65] Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., t. II, p. 760 et t. IV, p. 374-375.

[66] Dans ce rapport il est inutile d'examiner si d'autres caractères étaient inhérents au baptême des prosélytes; à mon avis il en est ainsi.

[67] W. Bousset-H. Gressmann, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*[3], Tübingen 1926, p. 304-306.

[68] Voir les passages dans: W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments*[3], Berlin 1937, col. 46-47. — Cependant il me paraît injuste d'énumérer — comme Bauer — les textes sur les esprits impurs sub 2: «m. Schwinden d. kult. Bed.»

[69] F. J. Dölger, *Exorcismus*, p. 17-38.

[70] Dölger, op. cit., p. 38-39.

[71] Voir J. H. Waszink, 'Pompa Diaboli', dans: *Vigiliae Christianae* I (1947), p. 13-41.

[72] Hippolytus, *Traditio Apostolica*, ed. Dix, xxi 10, p. 34.

[73] Dix, l.c. p. xi.

[74] Dans: *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, ed. Gebhardt, Harnack, Zahn, ed. minor[6], Leipzig 1920, p. 197.

[75] Ibid., p. 201.

[76] Ibid., p. 202.

[77] M. Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, Tübingen 1923, p. 615.

[78] Dans: Goldschmidt, op. cit., t. VI, p. 688: Dies ist die Art eines schlechten Menschen: er sieht ruhig zu, wie seine Frau barhäuptig, an beiden Seiten entblösst auf die Strasse geht. — La tradition parallèle du Talmud palestinien est plus clair, *Gittin* 9, 50d, cité par Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., t. I, p. 315: diejenige, die ausgeht mit aufgelöstem Haar u. deren Kleider an den Seiten aufgerissen u. deren Arme entblösst sind.

[79] A. Büchler, op. cit., p. 100-101.

[80] W. Bauer, op. cit., col. 827, s.v. μέλας.

NOTES ON A NEW INTERPRETATION OF THE ANAMNESIS WORDS*

The writings of Prof. Joachim Jeremias, Professor of New Testament Studies in the University of Göttingen, are as a rule slim in volume but rich in stimulating insights. They excel in originality of interpretation, which is the fruit of an intimate knowledge of Jewish literature and provide priceless contributions to exegesis. A comparison of the first and second editions of his books *Hat die Urkirche die Kindertaufe geübt?* and *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*[1] demonstrates the truth of *dies diem docet.* I want to begin this article with a warm recommendation to read Jeremias' writings precisely because I mean to draw attention to a rather seriously mistaken view in his latest book. This would perhaps not have been worthwhile, had not the text in question been one of crucial importance both for the study of the NT and for the practical life of the Church, namely the words recorded in the accounts of the Last Supper "do this in remembrance of me" (Luke 22:19 and 1 Cor. 11:24-26).

A great deal has been written in recent years about the question of this anamnesis, especially in connection with the views put forward by Odo Casel. We can quite properly bypass this discussion of the data from later liturgies[2]. The question that does need to be raised is, whether the *new* interpretation which Jeremias believes he must give to the words is justifiable. In the first edition of his *Abendmahlsworte* he considered them to be secondary, born out of Hellenistic ideas (in this following Lietzmann's exegesis)[3]. The second edition reveals a change of opinion on this point, as special attention is now paid to the anamnesis in his treatment of the "Words of Interpretation" under d) (p. 115-118); now he believes himself forced by his exegesis to conclude that "der Wiederholungsbefehl einen Sinn nur in Jesu eigenem Munde hat" (p. 118), and he summarises this exegesis in the title of d), ".... damit Gott meiner gedenke": in other words—to quote the famous saying of Korff—*the point of this reminder is aimed not at men but at God!*

I call this interpretation new because it has, as far as I know, not previously been put forward in this form. Stone's thought tended in that direction, when on the basis of the fact that ἀνάμνησις is in the Septuagint used three times to mean "bringing to God's remembrance" and only once "remembering among men", he saw both meanings included at the Last Supper[4]. The general conviction, however, has been that we have here an anamnesis among men. Jeremias himself mentions "die übliche Deutung, derzufolge die Jünger das Gedenken ausüben" (p. 117).

At the beginning of his argument Jeremias emphasises that it is not necessary to connect this remembrance, as Lietzmann does, with the commemorations of the dead found in Hellenistic circles, because remembrance played an important role in Palestinian Judaism (Passover, New Year liturgy). This is correct as far as it goes, but it appears to me that a small addition would not be out of place. For commemoration of the dead is not confined to a typically Hellenistic environment. To date it has been overlooked in discussions of this point that Wensinck deals with this "remembrance" as a part of Semitic mourning rites[5]. If we add the weight of this fact to Jeremias' own observations, then one need no longer argue that the evidence for choosing between Hellenistic and Palestinian usage is finely balanced[6], but rather that the balance comes down decisively on the Palestinian side.

If we now turn to the exegesis itself, we may agree that τοῦτο refers to the whole action and that ἐμήν here stands for an objective genitive. But how does Jeremias arrive at the idea that God should remember Jesus as the Messiah "*indem er das Reich herbeiführt in der Parusie*"? (the italics here as elsewhere are Jeremias'). We take note of the fact that these last words have no foundation in the text itself and are offered by Jeremias as a paraphrase! Two arguments are brought forward for this exegesis, one positive and the other negative.

1) That the disciples should keep Jesus' memorial Jeremias considers neither the only possible interpretation nor the most probable. As evidence he adduces Acts 10:4 εἰς μνημόσυνον ἔμπροσθεν τοῦ θεοῦ and Mark 14:9 εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς, making this last verse also indicate the "gnädige Gedenken Gottes" with references to one or two instances in Ecclesiasticus and 1 Enoch. If we begin with the second text, I must confess that I am totally baffled to account for such an interpretation by a scholar as discerning as Jeremias! For the full text surely states in so many words, that the remembrance will take place *on earth*; Mk. 14:9 = Matt. 26:13: ὅπου ἐὰν κηρυχθῇ τὸ εὐαγγέλιον εἰς ὅλον τὸν κόσμον, καὶ ὃ ἐποίησεν αὕτη λαληθήσεται εἰς μνημόσυνον αὐτῆς; how can anyone interpret this other than to mean that "along with the Gospel the memory of her act of faith will be spread over all the earth and live on"[7]? Acts 10:4 admittedly speaks of a remembering *before God* but that is spelled out expressis verbis and cannot be said to be implied in the words εἰς μνημόσυνον[8]. The confusion has arisen because Jeremias fails to make a clear distinction between these two different connections that can be made with the word "remembrance". The material from the Septuagint has been discussed in detail in my paper on Acts 10:4 cited above, and there is no need to repeat this here: the conclusion reached was that there can be remembrance on earth *and* in heaven (p. 274). The context usually

makes clear which is meant. What is quite certain, however, is that remembrance on earth is at least as important as the other; at such times one remembers sometimes some person, sometimes also the name of God and His mighty deeds. Pedersen and Wensinck before him[9] have pointed out that in the OT the remembrance (*zeker* or *zikkarôn*) is identical with the name. This association of ideas may be most succinctly illustrated by two quotations: "the extermination of the name is the strongest expression of annihilation", and, "one makes a name alive by mentioning it". The text which probably puts this most clearly is Prov. 10:7: "The righteous are remembered in blessings; the name of the wicked will rot away"[10]. Late Jewish commentary on this text proves that it was not understood as mention before God but as memory on earth.

> *Genesis Rabba* 49:1 (tr. Freedman, London 1939, vol. II, p. 419): "Said Rabbi Isaac: If one makes mention of a righteous man and does not bless him, he violates a positive command", a statement for which Prov. 10:7 is used as a prooftext, as it is for its opposite, the cursing of the wicked.
> *Numbers Rabba* 21:3 (tr. Slotki, London 1939, vol. II, p. 830): "Just as the Holy One, blessed be He, concerns Himself with the praise of the righteous, to publish it throughout the world, so He concerns Himself with the blame of the wicked, to publish it throughout the world"; proof again Prov. 10:7.

The texts, therefore, which Jeremias adduces here, cannot possibly support his argument, as only the words connected and the context indicate with whom the remembrance takes place, and that they by no means indicate forcibly that the "remembrance" always lies with God.

2) Jeremias reckons the usual interpretation to be strange posing as though to end all argument the question: "Fürchtet Jesus, dass die Jünger ihn vergessen konnten?" (p. 117), to which he obviously expects a negative answer. But can we be so sure about that? I will leave it to others to judge whether it is even right to pose the question in this way: the danger of allowing modern suppositions about the loyalty of the disciples to be brought into play and thus to give free rein to fantasy seems to me quite real. In any case, one might well answer Jeremias' question with a "yes" and then discover the balance of the Gospel texts to be on one's side. For he fails entirely to take cognizance of the mighty fact of the cross. In the predictions of the passion the fact that the disciples did not want to accept that Jesus had to die is underlined time and again. It is precisely around the time of the Last Supper, that we find this note once more sharply struck: "You will all fall from your faith on my account" (Mk. 14:27) followed by a reference to persecution. On this point the disciples were according to Luke 24:25 ff.; 44 ff. in need of special instruction after the resurrection. For this was not so much a matter of the fear of suffering as failure to understand God's way. Again, the letter

in which Paul gives us the account of the Last Supper contains in its opening chapter those famous words: "we preach Christ crucified, a stumblingblock to the Jews and folly to the Greeks" (1 Cor. 1:23). After all, the cross was for the Jews a sign of the curse (Gal. 3:12)[11] and for the Greeks symbol of a slave's death[12]. In the light of facts such as these there is every reason to maintain that there was great need to etch this "remembrance" sharply on the hearts of the disciples, as they would not have grasped this truth unaided. How were they to keep in "remembrance" one who was accursed and died a slave[13]? And that is assuredly "remembrance" on earth.

Jeremias believes, that his interpretation agrees with Paul, who in 1 Cor. 11:26 adds a note to explain "inwiefern die Mahlfeier der Gemeinde eine ἀνάμνησις an den Kyrios darstellt" (p. 117)[14]. With Schniewind[15] he takes καταγγέλλω to mean "Proklamation eines vollzogenen Geschehens", to wit the beginning of the time of God's salvation; ἄχρι οὗ κτλ is not simply a definition of time but draws our gaze to the Parousia with an allusion to the Maranatha. That is why the Lord's Supper is a remembrance: "nicht weil sie die Gemeinde an das Geschehen der Passion erinnert, sondern weil sie *den Beginn der Heilszeit proklamiert und den Anbruch der Vollerfüllung erfleht*" (p. 118). Taken as it stands, it is hard to see how this can be confirmation of the interpretation "remembrance before God"; is the proclamation then also directed at God? If one takes into account the use of καταγγέλλω in the NT[16], then the whole idea is absurd. Jeremias reckons to have forged the necessary link with his statement on p. 117: "Gottes Gedenken ist immer ein Handlen! *Gott gedenkt des Messias, indem er das Reich herbeiführt in der Parusie*". But with this sort of statement he strays far beyond the argument of his book. "Remembering" in this sense is far too activist in concept. This simply cannot be deduced from the texts which he cites for the use of this verb. Admittedly God's 'remembering' sooner or later results in active intervention (e.g. by punishing sin; by liberating the oppressed), but *cause and effect are to be clearly distinguished* (e.g. Exod. 2:23 ff: God remembers the covenant made with the patriarchs, i.e. a fact of past history, and on the basis of this sets about the liberation of Israel which is being oppressed in Egypt). The remembrance is, therefore, with Him the ground on which His action is based; in His judgment God remembers the service of the patriarchs or good deeds or His promise and *then* follows the word of pardon, or else God remembers the sins and *then* follows the punishment. Moreover Jeremias forgets in his account that we would be dealing with a prayer and that there is no certainty that this prayer will automatically be answered. We are also bound to ask ourselves, what in this case it means "to remember the

Messiah''. For when God remembers somebody, when the prayer is offered, ''Lord, remember me'', then this always concerns someone in need. Now, according to Jeremias' line of thought we can imagine that such a prayer had to be offered by the disciples *before* the cross, but then it would cease to have any point after the resurrection. If, on the other hand, it was meant to be prayed *after* the resurrection = salvation, then it is up against the New Testament witness that the Messiah is with God. However ''comprehensive'' Semitic thought might be, it did know how to draw distinctions. For this reason we cannot regard Jeremias' link as properly forged, and with that his argument falls to the ground.

Let us now take a look at 1 Cor. 11:26 on its own. Quite rightly Jeremias, and others before him, point out that vs. 26 is an explanatory comment from Paul's hand on the tradition concerning the Lord's Supper[17]. What he failed to see, however, is that the connection between paradosis and comment is far closer than is normally assumed. The standard explanations shed little light on the jump in Paul's paraphrase (note the repeat of ὁσάκις) from ''do this in remembrance of Me'' to ''announce, proclaim''. In 1943 I pointed to a possibility implied in the Aramaic[18]: do in remembrance[19] = do something, in order that a remembrance comes into being = mention; the hiphʿil forms of *zkr* have the meaning of 'mention', ''make known''. Although we must unfortunately make do without the possibility of corroboration from the Septuagint, as none of the occurrences of καταγγέλλω there have a semitic equivalent, nevertheless this meaning of the *zkr* stem is fully attested without such additional evidence[20]. The thrust of Paul's comment on the words of institution is, therefore, the exact opposite of Jeremias', as καταγγέλλω is consistently aimed at men.

The lexicographer Hesychius renders καταγγέλλω by κηρύσσω[21]. This accords with NT usage: as Schniewind has shown in his article, this is proved both by synonyms and parallels. The accent is always on preaching, speaking out. Both in Acts and in Paul's letters it is almost always used in connection with the preaching of Christ's death and His work to men in obedience to God[22]. Why then this should not be the case in 1 Cor. 11 is a mystery to me. Jeremias does say: ''es bezeichnet nicht die Verkündigung an Aussenstehende (die ja gar nicht anwesend sind)'' (p. 117). But, first of all, we simply do not know whether outsiders would be present or not at the Lord's Supper in Pauline congregations, and, secondly, the Christian community needs itself, as experience has shown quite clearly, to be constantly recalled to the death of Christ. There need be no objection to the statement, ''Proklamation eines vollzogenen Geschehens'' (Schniewind), so long as we recognise clearly, that ''Proklamation'' and ''Geschehen'' are not interchangeable and that the

emphasis is placed on "vollzogen". The "Geschehen" is here the death of the Lord, and this fact is for the NT the confirmation and inauguration of the new covenant; the proclamation points men to this fact, as indeed all missionary activity does, putting it into words. It is in my view totally unnecessary to distinguish, as Joh. Weiss does[23], between an "abgeblasste technische Missions-Sinn" and emphatic usage, or, with Schniewind, between a "missionarisch" and an "inner-christliches" use of the word. At all times it means the proclamation of the mighty saving work of God in the death of Christ. The close connection with "remembering" serves once again to underline this. There is a real distance between the event and the here and now.

It seemed to me by no means superfluous to spend some time on this issue. For it is fashionable in some circles today to deny this. Behm maintains, that it is not simply a matter of remembering but rather "die ἀνάμνησις handelnd vollziehen. Die Vergegenwärtigung des Herrn, des Stifters des Abendmahls, der durch seinen Tod die neue διαθήκη in Kraft gesetzt hat, durch die nacherlebende Gemeinde ist Ziel und Inhalt ihres 'Tuns' selbst"[24]. Terlaak Poot writes in his dissertation, that this proclamation is made not with words but with actions[25], and so one could cite others. This, it seems to me, involves a fatal shift of emphasis which is not warranted by the text; the accent comes to rest on "do" instead of on "remembrance". If we listen with care, we may discern in Behm the origin of this idea. The antithesis with which he begins derives from the fear which sends cold shivers along many a back at the mention of a "Zwinglian" view of the Lord's Supper: no more than a meal in memory of someone dead. So one tries by all manner of sleight of hand to get away from the "remembrance" but at the cost of doing violence to the text! The word "Vergegenwärtigung" has undertones of a view of the early Church's eucharistic practice which was for some time current in the "religionsgeschichtliche" school (particularly associated with G. P. Wetter[26]). Here the Lord's Supper is described as a "Kultmahl" by analogy with Hellenistic cultic practices, in which the cult brings forth a manifestation of the "Kultgott" (the theories of O. Casel have an affinity with this, though his presuppositions and conclusions are different). The general objections to this approach have been ably set out by Terlaak Poot[27]. I think, however, that it is nowadays generally agreed that it is precisely the historical, "once-for-all" nature of the work of salvation in Christianity which characteristically distinguishes it from the non-historical, cyclic mystery religions etc. In my view the voices which call us from these two sides are luring us in a false direction; the path thither is blocked by the factual philological study of the closely related meaning of "remembrance" and of "proclamation".

For Israel the Passover was "for a remembrance" of the liberation from Egypt. The well-known passage from the *Mishnah Pesachim*, X 5: "in every generation a man must so regard himself as if he came forth himself out of Egypt"[28], points, as does the whole context in the Mishnah, to the memory of a fact from the past. For it does not say that every generation must re-enact the Exodus and relive it anew. No; in the past a mighty deed was done by God, and the consequences of that deed continue into the present; it is an expression of the corporate nature of the people of Israel. Of all this men must needs speak to one another; for this praise and thanksgiving are offered to God. The Lord's Supper is experienced in the same way by the new Israel: the mighty deed was the death of the Lord[29], once for all (Hebr. 9:12, 26). This fact from the past whose effect will work through into eternity is remembered; it does not sink into oblivion but is made known, preached "until he comes". Such an understanding allows the words to retain their normal meaning in Biblical/Jewish usage and fits in entirely with the atmosphere of the Paschal meal, on which Jeremias rightly lays the emphasis. Of course such remembrance-proclamation was not merely a memorial of the dead, for to the first Christians Christ was the living Lord, but it was the remembrance of His death as the decisive turning-point, as the start of the new covenant. At His coming again this will naturally change (1 Thess. 4:17-18). Until such time the Lord's Supper is given in order firmly to anchor the memory of that great fact.

I would summarise the argument by saying that the interpretation of the anamnesis offered by Jeremias is exegetically untenable and that it would not appear superfluous in addition to underline more sharply than is often the case today the element of remembering—proclaiming among men here on earth.

NOTES

* This article originally appeared in the *Nederl. Theol. Tijdschrift* IV (1949-50), p. 369-377.

[1] J. Jeremias, *Hat die älteste Christenheit die Kindertaufe geübt?*, Göttingen 1938, 2nd ed. with altered title 1949; *Die Abendmahlsworte Jesu*, Göttingen 1935, 2nd ed. 1949. Eng. tr. of the 2nd ed. by Arnold Ehrhardt entitled, *The Eucharistic Words of Jesus*, Oxford 1955.

[2] See O. Casel, *Das Gedächtnis des Herrn in der altchristlichen Liturgie*, 5th ed., Freiburg i. Br. 1922; N. A. Dahl, 'Anamnesis. Memoire et commemoration dans le christianisme primitif', in: *Studia Theologica* I (1947), p. 69-95.

[3] Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 1st ed. p. 58, n. 3-59.

[4] D. Stone, 'Lord's Supper', in: Hastings, *Dictionary of Christ and the Gospels*, Edinburgh 1908, vol. II, p. 74. — Similar view in F. C. N. Hicks, *The Fulness of Sacrifice*, London 1946, p. 211 ff., cited by G. van der Leeuw, *Sacramentstheologie*, Nijkerk 1949, p. 53.

[5] A. J. Wensinck, 'Some Semitic Rites of Mourning and Religion', in: *Verhandelingen der Koninklijke Akademie van Wetenschappen te Amsterdam*, afd. Letterkunde, Nieuwe Reeks, deel XVIII 1, Amsterdam 1917, p. 24-27.

[6] Thus Jeremias, *Abendmahlsworte*, 2nd ed., p. 117. Subsequent references are all to the second edition.

[7] J. A. C. van Leeuwen-W. Lodder, *Het Evangelie van Mattheus*, 4th ed. Groningen-Batavia 1934, p. 159.

[8] See my article: 'De achtergrond en betekenis van Handelingen 10:4 en 35', in: *Nederlands Theologisch Tijdschrift* III (1948-1949), p. 260-283, 336-354 [English translation in *Sparsa Collecta* I, p. 213-258].

[9] A. J. Wensinck, op. cit., p. 27-29; J. Pedersen, *Israel. Its Life and Culture*, I-II, London-Copenhagen 1926, p. 254-257.

[10] The Septuagint translation here is particularly striking: μνήμη δικαίων μετ' ἐγκωμίων, ὄνομα δ' ἀσεβοῦς σβέννυται (i.e. on earth).

[11] cf. W. S. van Leeuwen, 'De zin van den kruisdood in de Synoptische Evangelien', in: *Nieuwe Theologische Studien* XXIV (1941), p. 68-81.

[12] cf. H. Lietzmann, *An die Korinther*, 3rd ed., Tübingen 1931, p. 9-10; E. Klostermann, *Das Markusevangelium*, 2nd ed., Tübingen 1926, p. 183. The awareness of this taunt can still be traced in the later apologetic tradition, cf. Gregory of Nyssa, *Oratio Catechetica*, ch. 32.

[13] Wensinck, op. cit., p. 26-27, pointed out that no memorial was held for slaves.

[14] Jeremias quotes for additional support from Didache X 5, because this prayer begins "Remember, Lord, ..." (p. 118); I will not discuss this further as this amounts at the most to a remembering before God *of the Church* and because it begins with a typically OT prayer form. What significance this could possibly have for a remembrance of the Messiah by God is a total mystery to me. It has no bearing on the issue here.

[15] J. Schniewind, in: G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum NT*, Vol. I. Stuttgart 1933, p. 70, s.v.

[16] See Schniewind op. cit., p. 68-71.

[17] See for example Joh. Weiss, *Der erste Korintherbrief*, Göttingen 1910, p. 288.

[18] W. C. van Unnik, 'Aramaeismen bij Paulus', in: *Vox Theologica* XIV (1943), p. 124 [English translation in *Sparsa Collecta* I, p. 129-143].

[19] cf. also Wisdom of Sol. 16:6 about the brass serpent in the wilderness (cf. John 3:14-15) σύμβολον ἔχοντες σωτηρίας, εἰς ἀνάμνησιν ἐντολῆς νόμου σου and the parallel expression: εἰς μνημόσυνον for example in Esther. See also a phrase such as εἰς μαρτύριον Matt. 8:4 etc.

[20] See J. Levy, *Wörterbuch über die Talmudim und Midraschim*, 2nd ed., Vol. I, Berlin-Wien 1924, p. 405-406, 536-538; L. Köhler, *Lexicon in Veteri Testamenti Libros*, Leiden 1949, p. 255-258; J. Payne Smith, *A Compendious Syriac Dictionary*, Oxford 1903, p. 92.

[21] J. Schleusner, *Novus Thesaurus philologico-criticus sive Lexicon in LXX*, Vol. III, Leipzig 1820, p. 198.

[22] Usage in NT: Acts 3:24; 4:2; 13:5, 38; 15:36; 16:17, 21; 17:3, 13, 23; 26:23; Rom. 1:8; 1 Cor. 2:1; 9:14; 11:26; Phil. 1:17-18; Col. 1:28.

[23] Joh. Weiss, op. cit., p. 45.

[24] Joh. Behm, in: G. Kittel, op. cit., p. 351-352.

[25] L. D. Terlaak Poot, *Het oudchristelijk Avondmaal en zijn historische perspectieven* (Amsterdam dissertation), Wageningen 1936, p. 190-191, following Joh. Weiss in his commentary on 1 Cor. 11:26.

[26] G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien: das christliche Mysterium*, Göttingen 1921.

[27] L. D. Terlaak Poot, op. cit. p. 42-57.

[28] G. Beer, 'Pesachim (Ostern)', in: G. Beer-O. Holtzmann, *Die Mischna*, Giessen 1912, p. 194.

[29] G. Wiencke, *Paulus über Jesu Tod; die Deutung des Todes Jesu bei Paulus und ihre Herkunft*, (in: *Beiträge zur Förderung christlicher Theologie*, 2. Reihe, Vol. 42), Gütersloh 1939.

1 CLEMENT 34 AND THE "SANCTUS"*

Introduction

One of the generally accepted results of the investigation of 1 Clement is the fact that this letter, written by the Roman church to that of Corinth in 95-96 AD, is largely dependent upon and influenced by the liturgy. This fact has been established, so it seems, beyond any doubt, since the end of the letter with the great prayer (ch. 59:2-61:3) came to light[1]. Because our information about the origin and development of the liturgy before the fourth century is very scarce, the witness of 1 Clement has a great weight which is duly recognised by scholars.

> Two statements from modern handbooks on the history of the early church may be quoted to show the importance attached to this evidence: (i) Lietzmann wrote in his discussion of the writing: "Ausser dem Alten Testament, einigen Herrensprüchen und den Paulusbriefen wird noch eine letzte Quelle zitiert, die uns einen unvermuteten Aufschluss spendet: die römische Liturgie. Nicht nur am Ende des Briefes, wo sich Clemens zum Gebet wendet, sondern bereits an drei Stellen vorher klingen unverkennbar liturgisch gestaltete Worte an unser Ohr, die gottesdienstlichen Formeln der hauptstädtischen Gemeinde entstammen müssen. Und sie lehren uns, dass diese Gemeinde ihre Liturgie der Synagoge entlehnt hat.... Die christlichen Änderungen und Einschübe sind kenntlich, aber ebenso sicher ist der jüdische Charakter des ganzen übrigen Textes gegeben"; in this passage Lietzmann refers to ch. 33:2-6, 34:5-8, 38:3-4 and 59:2-61:3[2]. In his description of the prayer-life in the primitive church Lebreton quotes the full text of 1 Clem. 59:2 ff. and gives this comment: "Dans cette prière, si proche encore par bien des traits, des prières juives, on distingue déjà les caractères traditionnels qui marqueront la liturgie chrétienne; on les retrouve dans d'autres morceaux de cette lettre, qui font entendre eux aussi l'accent de la liturgie primitive et qui s'apparentent déjà aux liturgies du IVe siècle, par exemple aux prières des *Constitutions Apostoliques*", the prooftexts being ch. 20, 33, 34[3]. It is needless to give more references, since expositors of the letter and liturgists are in complete agreement[4].

As may be seen from these quotations, one of the clear echoes of the liturgy is found in ch. 34. It is "an allusion to the *Sanctus* .... which was probably even then a customary part of the eucharist", says Maxwell in his popular book on the history of the liturgy[5], voicing the opinion current in many circles. The slight doubt, expressed in the word "probably", is not even felt by some scholars who are quite convinced that it was a part.

Before reviewing the arguments in favour of this view we will give the full text of the passage. Generally the verses 5b-8 are quoted, but for

reasons that will become clear in the course of our discussion it is preferable to make our starting point somewhat earlier, viz. in 4, in order that the course of the argument in which Clement makes the allusion may be kept intact. The text runs as follows:

(4) προτρέπεται οὖν ἡμᾶς πιστεύοντας ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας ἐπ' αὐτῷ, μὴ ἀργοὺς μηδὲ παρειμένους εἶναι ἐπὶ πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθόν. (5) τὸ καύχημα ἡμῶν καὶ ἡ παρρησία ἔστω ἐν αὐτῷ. ὑποτασσώμεθα τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ· κατανοήσωμεν τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος τῶν ἀγγέλων αὐτοῦ, πῶς τῷ θελήματι αὐτοῦ λειτουργοῦσιν παρεστῶτες. (6) λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή· Μύριαι μυριάδες παρειστήκεισαν αὐτῷ, καὶ χίλιαι χιλίαδες ἐλειτούργουν αὐτῷ, καὶ ἐκέκραγον· Ἅγιος, ἅγιος, ἅγιος κύριος σαβαώθ, πλήρης πᾶσα ἡ κτίσις τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ'. (7) καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες τῇ συνειδήσει, ὡς ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος βοήσωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκτενῶς εἰς τὸ μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων ἐπαγγελιῶν αὐτοῦ. (8) λέγει γάρ· 'Οφθαλμὸς οὐκ εἶδεν καὶ οὖς οὐκ ἤκουσεν καὶ ἐπὶ καρδίαν ἀνθρώπου οὐκ ἀνέβη', ὅσα ἡτοίμασεν τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν'[6]. Question: do we find here an unmistakable proof that the author has the liturgy of his time in his mind, and therefore that the "Sanctus"[7] was a part of the eucharistic service?

The Present State of the Question

The first elaborate exposition of "*liturgical interpretation*" was given by Probst in 1870. He was sure that there had existed from the very beginning a fixed liturgy, "was ihr Wesen und den Gang der Handlung betrifft, nach einem von Christus und den Aposteln herrührenden Muster gefeiert"[8], which he identified with the so-called Clementine liturgy (*Const. Apost.* VIII 5-14). It is superfluous in this connexion to criticize his fantastic argumentation of this point, but it was necessary to call attention to it because of the present issue. As a matter of fact ch. 34 is his startingpoint for the discussion of "Der Brief des Clemens und die Liturgie überhaupt" (heading of § 16), the first sentences of which may be quoted in full: "Der alten Liturgie zufolge sprach das Volk in dem Dankgebet das dreimal heilig[9]. Die Übereinstimmung zwischen dem Trishagion des Clemens und der Liturgie ist unzweifelhaft. Wenn der Inhalt desselben auch der Schrift entlehnt ist, verdient doch die Aehnlichkeit, welche einer Combination aus Daniel 7:10 und Isaias 6:3 entspringt, Beachtung. Dasselbe muss aber auch zur Zeit des Clemens in der Liturgie gebetet worden sein; denn wenn er den Korinthern schreibt: auch wir wollen wie aus einem Munde das heilig rufen, so ist das dasselbe, was die Liturgie sagt" (p. 41-42). The expressions used in vs. 7a speak of a eucharistic service, as is proved by a comparison with Paul, 1 Cor. 11:20 (the other explanations will be mentioned in the discussion

on p. 343 ff.; it is worth while to notice that Probst does not give here parallels from the liturgical texts). Next he quotes vs. 7b-36:1, omitting however 35:5b ἀπορρίψαντες—the end of the chapter. He argues that Christ is proclaimed here to be the contents of the "glorreiche Verheissung, die Gabe ... im höchsten Sinn"; in vs. 8 = 1 Cor. 2:9 the author has Christ in view "dessen uns das Gebet des Trishagion theilhaftig macht", for from various authors both ecclesiastical and heretical it is clear that they connect 1 Cor. 2:9 with Christ and the liturgy. His conclusion is: "der Weg, auf dem die Korinther der glorreichen Verheissungen und Gaben theilhaftig werden, besteht nicht nur in einem gottseligen Wandel, sondern auch in dem einmüthigen Rufen zu Gott in der Liturgie. Dass Clemens in den Worten: "wenn wir das dreimal heilig rufen, werden wir dieser Verheissungen theilhaftig" den Theil für das Ganze setzt.... setzen wir als selbstverständlich voraus. Dieser Gottesdienst ist die Feier der Eucharistie, denn in ihr empfangen die Gläubigen Christus" (p. 46)[10].

A different line, but leading to the same result, was followed by Lightfoot[11]. According to him, the writer "before he enters upon the main subject of the letter—the feuds in the Corinthian Church—...places himself and his readers in an attitude of prayer, as the fittest appeal to their hearts and consciences". He draws attention to 29:1; 30:1; 31:1; 32:1b; "the greatness of God's gifts reminds him of their proper counterpart—our ministrations due to Him by the law of reciprocity; these were rendered under the Old Covenant by the levitical hierarchy: they culminate under the New in Jesus Christ (32)". In ch. 33 Lightfoot underlines vs. 1b and 4-5 (commenting this by "we are made in God's own likeness, and are consequently the heirs of His blessing"). Then he comes to our particular point: "Our ministrations on earth are the copy and counterpart of the angelic ministrations in heaven. Only the eye and ear of faith are needed (34:5 κατανοήσωμεν.....) to recall the sight and sound of these celestical choirs..... Here again we are brought face to face with a leading feature of the ancient liturgical service, the 'ter sanctus' as the ideal of our human ministrations", referring to Cyril of Jerusalem, *Cat. Myst.* v 5. The combination of the two scripture-places might be due to the liturgy. "After thus ushering us into the immediate presence-chamber of the Almighty, he follows up this eucharistic reference by a direct practical precept bearing on congregational worship", viz. vs. 7, "where almost every individual expression recalls the liturgical forms". 1 Cor. 2:9 is another characteristic reference which is found in early liturgies. "After this liturgical climax, the writer not unnaturally speaks of the marvellous *gifts* of God" (ch. 35). "Their magnitude and beauty are beyond all human language. Of these proffered bounties ...we must

strain every nerve to partake. Accordingly we approach God with the sacrifice of praise.... This is the *way*, of which the Psalmist speaks 50 (49):23—the way of salvation. Along this way we proceed, under the guidance of our great High-priest who presents our offerings" (ch. 36); all human life is a great eucharistic service.

While Lightfoot expressly referred to and seems to be influenced by Probst, the latter could not win adherents to his view in his own country[12]. The change of mind with regard to 1 Clem. 34 was brought in 1906, when P. Drews published his studies on the Clementine Liturgy. He compared various parts of the epistle with the text of *Apost. Const.* VIII and his sober way of reasoning proved to be convincing. As to our particular point he says: "Hier sagt Clemens selbst, dass er von der Liturgie rede, wie sie in der sonntäglichen Versammlung üblich war. Denn die Formel: ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες ist der technische Ausdruck für die gottesdienstliche Versammlung". He offers a comparison in parallel columns of 34:5-8 with *C.A.* VIII 12-13, which leads him to the conclusion: "Clemens kennt also nicht nur die Sitte, dass die Gemeinde im Gottesdienst das Trishagion nach Jesaias 6:3 ruft, seine Worte geben, das lehrt die Parallele aus *C.A.* VIII, c. 12, auch deutliche Kunde davon, dass in seiner Liturgie in Verbindung damit die Verwendung von Dan. 7:10 üblich war". Though Drews admits that the same combination is found in other liturgies as well, he declares that the parallels in other parts of the epistle point to the Clementine liturgy only. Special attention is given to the use of 1 Cor: 2:9 = vs. 8 in later liturgies which shows according to Drews a special ancient liturgical tradition[13].

The success of Drews' thesis can be seen from the change of attitude by the latest commentator Knopf[14]. In his former exposition he does not say a word about liturgical reminiscences, while in his latter commentary in Lietzmann's "Handbuch" he devotes a special "Excurs" to the matter, in which he refers to Probst and Drews. On vs. 5 he says: "als Beispiel von Unterordnung werden hier die Scharen der göttlichen Engel gebracht..... λειτουργεῖν = dienen und zwar im Kultus, Act. 13:2, Hebr. 10:11, und sehr oft in LXX". His comment on vs. 7 reads as follows: „Wir werden hier mit einem Schlage in die zum Gottesdienste versammelte Gemeinde geführt. Clemens spricht hier so, als ob er vor der Gemeindeversammlung stünde und er setzt auch voraus, dass der Brief zu Korinth in der Gemeindeversammlung verlesen werde. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ und συνάγεσθαι...sind technische Ausdrücke". In the "Excurs" some more proofs for liturgical terminology are brought: ἐκτενῶς "ein technischer Ausdruck der Liturgie, der in den altkrichlichen Liturgien immer und immer wieder von dem heissen, andächtigen Gebete gebraucht wird..... Weiter bildet das Trishagion, soweit wir sehen können, stets einen festen

Bestandteil der Liturgie....Auch ist seine Verbindung mit Dan. 7:10 altes liturgisches Gut.....Wie in 1 Clemens vorausgesetzt wird (... vs. 7), wird in diesen Liturgien das Trishagion von der Gemeinde gesprochen, oder mindestens nachgesprochen.....das Trishagion.... bildet eine der ältesten und sichersten Bestandteile der Liturgie. Übrigens kehrt auch der in 34:8 gebrachte Spruch in den Gebeten verschiedener altchristlicher Liturgien wieder", while leaving it undecided whether Clement got it from Paul or from the liturgy. These statements are made by adducing parallel material from various liturgies, though it is remarkable that the comments upon vs. 8 are rather vague. It will further be observed that Knopf is using the word "altkirchliche Liturgien" rather loosely without exactly defining the date of the liturgies he is comparing with the document from the end of the first century: anyhow he calls the "Clementine Liturgy" the oldest.

This was the situation about 1920. Our text has been compared with the liturgy found in the 8th book of the *Constitutiones Apostolorum*, which itself is a document of the second half of the 4th century[15], and from similarity with regard to Jes. 6:3 and from vs. 7 the conclusion has been drawn that Clement was thinking of a liturgy of the same type. We cannot help thinking that the name "Clementine Liturgy" is rather confusing, suggesting as it does that there is any real connection with the letter, while there is no other link than the fact that the *Const. Apost.* have been spuriously ascribed to Clement.

Three facts have changed the scene in the meanwhile. First, Bousset discovered that in the 7th book of the *Const. Apost.* a Hellenistic-Jewish prayerbook had been incorporated; this was of importance for the present question since he could show the similarity between the "Sanctus" in *Const. Apost.* VII 35 and the Jewish liturgy where it is known as the *Qedusha*[16].—The second fact was that Schwarz and Connolly proved independently that the 8th book of *C.A.* was based upon the lost Church Order of Hippolytus[17]; the reconstruction of this document from various sources[18] brought to light, however, that it had not contained the "Sanctus"! In the third place, continued study of the history of the liturgy has shown that the form of the liturgy which is *now* found in the *Const Apost.* VIII belongs to the Antiochene type from the time of Chrysostom[19]. To what extent have these facts thrown a different light upon the point at issue?

Baumstark, writing about the "Sanctus", first regarded our text as a probable allusion: "Seinen frühesten Widerhall *scheint* derartiger Gebrauch des Stückes bereits in dem Schreiben des Römers Klemens.... zu finden, wenn (34:6) dem Verfasser Dan. 7:10 und Is. 6:3 zu einem einzigen freien *Schriftzitat* zusammenfliessen und *in unmittelbarem Anschluss*

an dieses von einem Zu-Gott-Rufen auch der zur kultischen Feier versammelten irdischen Gemeinde redet"; he quotes the passage from λέγει γὰρ—πρὸς αὐτόν B. 18. He combats the views of Cabrol and Cagin who did not regard the "Sanctus" as an original part of the liturgy and on p. 21 and 27 he is quite positive[20].

Oesterley, studying the "Jewish background of the Christian liturgy"[21] considered the *Qedusha* of the synagogue the model of the "Sanctus". The Jewish Christians took it over and "ensured its continuance in Christian worship after their final withdrawal from the Jewish Church; hence we find in the earliest records of specifically Christian worship the mention of the *Trishagion*", in proof of which 1 Clem. 34:5 ff. is quoted; since public worship is clearly referred to in ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες, it is evident that it was used in the church-service, while ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος "implies that the congregation took part in saying, or more probably singing, it".

Lietzmann[22] followed suit to Bousset in ascribing the origin of the "Sanctus" to influence of the Hellenistic synagogue; according to him, Hippolytus shows the more ancient "rein christliche Typ des Eucharistiegebets"; but: "damit ist natürlich nicht gesagt, dass ein solch hellenistisch-jüdisches, in ein Sanctus ausmündendes Gotteslob nicht bereits früher aus der Synagoge übernommen und bei Gelegenheit im Gottesdienst an anderer Stelle in Gebrauch gewesen sei. Es gehört eben nur nicht zum ursprünglichen Bestand der Abendmahlsliturgie.....Es findet sich ja bereits Ende des I Jh. im Clemensbrief 33 ein diesem Gebet nächstverwandter Lobpreis Gottes, dem schwerlich zufällig 34:5-7 ...folgen.... Wer das schrieb, der kannte die Rezitation einer aus Bibelworten nach Dan. 7:10 komponierten Schilderung der Engelchöre und ihres Lobgesanges, des jesajanischen Dreimal-heilig, in den die Gemeinde einstimmte, als liturgische Sitte seiner Kirche". From Hippolytus it appears that in the beginning of the 3rd cent. it had not yet been incorporated into the eucharistic liturgy.

The comprehensive review of the liturgical development by Brilioth has two passages bearing upon our subject[23]. The former one dealing with 1 Clement states that Drews had rendered it probable that this epistle has preserved traces of liturgical forms "and, above all, that in chap. 34 the mention of the hosts of angels singing the threefold 'holy' means that the *Sanctus* had already become part of the service". In the second passage he follows Bousset, Oesterley and Lietzmann in considering the "Sanctus" derived from the Jewish liturgy; it must have been introduced at an early date since it is quoted by Clement and because "it is hard to believe that the church of the third or even the fourth century would have borrowed it from the synagogue" (a statement

which is repeated on the next page); the fact that it is missing in Hippolytus should not be explained with Lietzmann as an omission, but because the formulary of Hippolytus is one for a special occasion.

The position of Srawley is not quite clear[24]. He deals with ch. 34 as a passage in which "Clement has been thought to make use of liturgical language current in the worship of the church". He mentions the well-known facts (combination of Dan. 7:10 with Is. 6:3; the phraseology of vs. 7; the quotation of vs. 8), which he compares with similar phrases found in later liturgies. It seems as though he is hesitating, but is more or less in favour of the idea that there was some influence.

2. *The opposite view:* 1 Clement 34:6 does not reflect the liturgical practice. According to various scholars such as Cabrol[25], W. H. Frere and Ratcliff[26], the connection assumed by the previous view is impossible, since the introduction of the "Sanctus" into the liturgy was later than 1 Clement. As to the text of the epistle itself Rahmani said: "il n'y a rien dans le contexte qui autorise à conclure qu'elle vise la prière eucharistique"[27] and Botte was of the same opinion[28]. In recent years two English students of the liturgy, Dugmore and Dix, coming from different angles attained the same result. The former, in studying the "influence of the synagogue upon the divine office", maintained that the *Qedusha* was a new thing and that "it is impossible to maintain that it, too, is embedded in the prayer of 1 Clement", since the original form of the *Qedusha* had no resemblance to the early Christian prayer and cannot have become the "Ṣanctus"; it must have been introduced after the time of Hippolytus, and it is not mentioned in connexion with worship before Cyril of Jerusalem[29]. The author of the voluminous book on the "Shape of the Liturgy"[30] gives the following argument: "Earlier (viz. before Origen) citations of the words of the angelic hymn from the scriptures by Clement of Rome and Tertullian do not necessarily reflect a use of it at the eucharist, and it is absent from Hippolytus' liturgy and from some other early documents....The simplest explanation of these various facts is that the use of the preface and sanctus in the eucharistic prayer begun in the Alexandrian Church at some time before AD 230, and from there spread first to other Egyptian Churches, and ultimately all over Christianity".

In examining the *status quaestionis* we must say: *sub judice lis est*[31]. On the one hand, the overwhelming majority of scholars who maintained that 1 Clement is most certainly referring to the liturgical practice of his day. Among the modern expositors of 1 Clement and numerous students of the early liturgy it has become an established fact—one would almost say a "dogma"[32] which has found its way into popular books on the history of the liturgy.

In the preceding pages we have given the arguments for this exegesis. Probst showed the way in calling attention to the so-called "Clementine Liturgy" and his track was followed by the other commentators who gave it a sounder basis from the whole context (Lightfoot) or from a more thorough-going comparison with other liturgical material (Drews, Knopf). It was necessary to give full analyses of the various contributions, for only in this way we can see whether this particular interpretation was reached along right lines.

On the other hand, a number of liturgiologists think it impossible that 1 Clement has been influenced by the liturgy without arguing, however, from the text of Clement itself or offering another explanation. This seems to be a grave defect to the present writer. And though there may be a growing tendency among leading liturgiologists to reject the liturgical interpretation[33], there will remain uncertainty as long as the state of affairs in 1 Clement 34 has not been cleared up.

At any rate, it seemed necessary to subject the matter to a fresh examination on the basis of an exegesis of the relevant passage. It will have become clear that the discussion is not concerned with a minor point, but that the answer to our question is of great importance for the history of the liturgy. There are two possibilities: 1) if it is true that Clement is thinking of the "Sanctus", there must have been a form which was the nucleus of the later liturgies already in existence at the end of the first century, the introduction from Jewish sources must have taken place at a still earlier date and some reasons must be brought forward to explain its absence from Hippolytus; 2) if on the other hand the exegesis of 1 Clem. 34 does not show any traces of liturgical use, there is no need to assume a fixed liturgical form and the introduction may have taken place at a later date. This means: *the whole reconstruction of the history of the liturgy as given by some authors is at stake.*

Before we enter upon this task, three preliminary observations should be made.

1) The generally accepted exegesis reads our passage as though there is a parallelism between the service of God in heaven and on earth. This is an interpretation on the line of the fourth century. One text out of a long array may make this clear[34]. In Chrysostom we read: ἄνω στρατιαὶ δοξολογοῦσιν ἀγγέλων, κάτω ἐν ἐκκλησίαις χοροστατοῦντες ἄνθρωποι τὴν αὐτὴν ἐκείνοις ἐκμιμοῦνται δοξολογίαν· ἄνω τὰ σεραφὶμ τὸν τρισάγιον ὕμνον ἀναβοᾷ, κάτω τὸν αὐτὸν ἡ τῶν ἀνθρώπων ἀναπέμπει πληθύς[35]. But is it too subtle a question, if we ask: is this to be read in the text of Clement? Anyone who has read some pages of liturgical exposition from the fourth century will have been struck by the difference in tone and atmosphere between

Clement and those later writers. A detailed exegesis is necessary as the only way to reach a decision.

2) We have seen that it was Drews who made out the case by comparing 1 Clement with the liturgy of *Const. Apost.* VIII. Does his whole theory about the liturgical background of the epistle not fall flat, because the bottom of this theory was knocked out by the new light shed on the composition of the *Const. Apost.*? It seems to the present writer that the whole problem must be studied afresh and that a new explanation of the facts to which he called attention must be tried. However this may be, here we are only concerned with the relation of ch. 34 and the "Sanctus" which has always been the corner-stone.

3) As to the history of the "Sanctus", it should be said that there are no traces of it in the second century. It is agreed that it is not found in Hippolytus. Drews c.s. could not know this, but Lietzmann and Brilioth tried to find an explanation for it by assuming that it was already in 1 Clement; but if this is not the case, the whole matter gets a different aspect. The references in Tertullian do not allow the inference that it was in his liturgy, as was shown in the careful study of E. Dekkers[36]. As to Justin's account of the liturgy, Drews said that the "Sanctus" was not expressly mentioned there: "wenn man aus I. Apol. c. 6. einen Beweis für den Gebrauch des Trishagions hat entnehmen wollen, so ist das ganz verfehlt. Aber ebenso verfehlt wäre es, aus dem Nichterwähnen das Nichtvorhandensein schliessen zu wollen. Wenn schon I Cl. das Trishagion kennt, bestand es zur Zeit Justins ohne allen Zweifel"[37]. Here again we see that 1 Clem. is the deciding factor and the only unquestionable fact in Drews' argument is that it is missing in Justin!

Exegesis of 1 Clement 34:4-8.

A. For a proper understanding of this passage it is necessary to read it in its own context; it is not sufficient to quote the sentences themselves without paying attention to the question why Clement wrote them down. It is moreover advisable to be very careful in paraphrasing. When Probst e.g. gives this "translation" of vs. 7: "auch wir wollen wie aus einem Munde das *heilig* rufen" (p. 41-42) or "wenn wir das dreimal heilig rufen werden wir dieser Verheissungen theilhaftig" (p. 46) and does consider it a "pars pro tota liturgia", or when van der Schoot gives this abstract: "In ch. 34 of this letter the: Holy, holy, holy, is cited from Is. 6, after which it continues in this way: "Und auch wir, einmütig und andächtig versammelt, wollen nachdrücklich wie mit einem Munde zu ihm hinaufrufen, auf dass wir seiner grossen und herrlichen Verheissungen teilhaftig werden", following Knopf's translation and comments, and

concluding that the "Sanctus" had "obviously" its place in the liturgy[38], it gives, to say the least, a wrong impression and it is easy to win the game!

We will stick to 1 Clement's text and not take into consideration the question of the *Qedusha* (cf. p. 330 ff. above). Its introduction into the Jewish liturgy is a matter of dispute and far from clear[39]. At any rate, its existence in pre-Christian times has not been proven. The argument of Brilioth does not hold good and is a mere conjecture. It is not necessary, even if it were true that the *Qedusha* was used in the pre-Christian Jewish liturgy, to assume that it was taken over by the early Christians; the "Sanctus" might have been introduced directly from Is. 6 in the time, when it became usual to see the church-service on earth as an imitation of the service in heaven, but it is more than we can know at present to say that this was the case already at the end of the first century. At any rate, it must be possible to read the text of Clement by itself.

B. By what way does Clement come to this pronouncement? Even from a cursory reading of the preceding and following chapters of this epistle it is *luce clarius* that our particular passage is linked up from beginning to end with its context. It is so embedded in the whole train of thought that it cannot be set apart unless one would run the risk of missing the point.

After having spoken about God's favours which will become a judgment to those who are disobedient to His will, about the coming resurrection and about God's irresistable power (ch. 19-27), Clement says: "Since therefore all things are seen and heard[40], let us fear Him, and forsake the abominable lusts of evil works, that we may be shielded by His mercy from the coming judgments"[41], for nobody can escape Him, cf. Ps. 139:7-10 since He "embraceth the universe" (ch. 28). "Let us therefore approach Him in holiness of soul, lifting up pure and undefiled hands unto Him[42], with love towards our gentle and compassionate Father, who made us an elect portion unto Himself", as is shown by several places from the OT (Deut. 32:8-9, Deut. 4:34 etc.) (ch. 29). This biblical thought of the elect and holy "portion" (or people) requires holiness of its members; therefore the writer continues by saying: "let us do all things that pertain unto holiness", which is illustrated in a negative manner: it consists in avoiding all sorts of vices, especially pride, and positively: "let us therefore cleave unto those to whom grace is given from God; let us clothe ourselves in concord, being lowly-minded and temperate, etc.". Praise must be given by God and other men, not by themselves. "Boldness and arrogance and daring are for them that are accursed of God; but forbearance and humility and gentleness are with

them that are blessed of God''. (ch. 30; this chapter is clearly written with an eye upon the situation in Corinth and reflects Clement's view of the matter)[43]. Of course he admonishes his readers to see ''what are the ways of blessing''. That may be seen from the lives of the three Patriarchs (ch. 31). Especially with regard to Jacob he says: ''If any man will consider them one by one in sincerity, he shall understand the magnificence of the gifts that are given by Him'', for out of Him are the priests of the OT, is the Lord Jesus[44], are kings and rulers in the line of Judah, while all tribes were highly honoured. They were all glorified through God's will and not by their own works; so are we not justified by our own capacities, but through faith (ch. 32).

With a kind of question which recalls Paul's words Rom. 6:1, he takes a new start (the foregoing chapter ending with a doxology): ''What then must we do, brethren? Must we idly abstain from doing good, and forsake love? May the Master never allow this to befall us at least; but let us hasten with instancy and zeal to accomplish every good work. For the Creator and Master of the universe Himself rejoiceth in His works''. A description of the various phases of the creation follows[45], ending with: ''He blessed them and said, *Increase and multiply*''. The readers are stimulated[46] to see, ''that all the righteous were adorned in good works and even the Lord Himself[47] having adorned Himself with good[48] works rejoiced''. Therefore they must with all their strength work a righteous work (ch. 33).

Chapter 34 begins with the difference between a good and a careless workman; the first one receives his reward with frankness, while the other does not dare to look his employer in the face (§ 1). ''It is therefore needful that we should be zealous unto welldoing, for of Him are all things'', both glory and punishment, ''since He forewarneth us saying, *Behold, the Lord, and His reward is before His face, to recompense each man according to his work*'' (§ 2-3). This quotation is not found in the OT; it might be a combination of texts such as Is. 40:10, 62:11, Prov. 24:12, Ps. 62:13, cf. Apoc. 22:12 or from an apocryphal source[49]. Then follows the passage 34:8-4 (see below p. 337 ff.) which calls for a more detailed treatment.

The analysis of these chapters yields this result: (i) the judgment of God is coming in which He will punish the wicked and bless the good (cf. Paul, 2 Cor. 5:10[50]); (ii) this blessing is only to be received through faith; (iii) but while living before the judgment we must avoid all vices and live righteously by doing good works; (iv) these good works must be done, because we are the ''holy portion of the holy Lord'', in imitating Him (cf. Eph. 5:1) who rejoiced in His work of the creation; in obedience to God's will, which requires among other things concord and peace (cf. ch. 21);

(v) this is an attack on the behaviour of the people who made the disturbance in the church of Corinth and brought about the writing of the letter.

In reading these chapters one sees how all the sentences are neatly knit together and form a well-ordered train of thought. The whole Christian life and especially one facet of it, the troubles in the church of Corinth, is placed in the light of the coming final judgment.

We have given this broad analysis to bring the verses 4-8 into the right perspective, but also to correct the misrepresentation by Lightfoot (see p. 329 above). It is really astonishing to read in which way he paraphrases these chapters. He was right in taking into account the whole context, which is often neglected by others; but this great expositor, who has deserved so well of this epistle, has absolutely gone astray by failing to see the eschatological outlook and replacing it by a church-service. He reached this result by picking out here and there a text which suited his purpose, in a very tendentious manner. It is needless to bring detailed proof of this, since everyone reading through the whole letter of Clement can easily perceive the fact.

C. We will now give a commentary on the disputed verses:

§ 4. προτρέπεται = he urges on, impells (cf. Liddell-Scott, *Greek-English Lexicon*[9], Oxford 1940, vol. II, p. 1537a) by the forewarning of the Scripture-text given in vs. 3, i.e. by revealing to us the coming judgment with the coming reward, cf. 27:1, 28:1.

οὖν = therefore; this is often used in this epistle[51]. It does not give merely the conclusion of the preceding sentence, but there is always a short gap before οὖν: the preceding sentence has brought a certain thought to a close; the new sentence, opened by οὖν, takes up the main thought of a foregoing passage and then brings a new turn. An examination of all the instances in 1 Clem. entitles us to apply here the words of Blass-Debrunner[52]: "es wird hier teils angegeben, was weiter geschah, teils die Summe aus dem Vorhergehenden gezogen, um den Übergang zu etwas Neuem zu bilden", see e.g. 30:1, 33:1, 48:1 and very clearly 57:1.

πιστεύοντας: Knopf translates: "Er mahnt uns also, aus vollem Herzen an ihn zu glauben und dabei zu keinem guten Werke faul und lässig zu sein"; this is right in so far as αὐτῷ is not the reward (Lightfoot), but God, vs. 2, 5 (see for this construction Bauer[53], col. 1103), but it is not to be taken as a verbum finitum. Knopf's comment: "Beachte wieder die Verknüpfung von Glauben und Werken" brings in a false thought of juxtaposition. It is in contradiction with the clear utterance 32:4 and with the whole purport of this passage: God is not urging us to faith and works, but us, who believe and may be careless, to do good works.

πιστεύοντες = practically "the Christians", cf. 12:7, 42:4 and Bauer, col. 1103.

ἐξ ὅλης τῆς καρδίας: they must not be δίψυχοι, cf. the very illuminating parallel from the story of Lot in 11:2 συνεξελθούσης γὰρ αὐτῷ τῆς γυναικὸς ἑτερογνώμονος ὑπαρχούσης καὶ οὐκ ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ, εἰς τοῦτο σημεῖον ἐτέθη, ὥστε γενέσθαι αὐτὴν στήλην ἁλὸς ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης, εἰς τὸ γνωστὸν εἶναι πᾶσιν, ὅτι οἱ δίψυχοι καὶ οἱ διστάζοντες περὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ δυνάμεως εἰς κρίμα καὶ εἰς σημείωσιν πάσαις ταῖς γενεαῖς γίνονται (n.b. the "keywords" ὁμόνοια—διστάζοντες which show that the example is directed against the rebels in Corinth) and the apocryphal quotation in 23:3 to strengthen the saying in vs. 2. Is here a reminiscence of the "Great Commandment", Mc. 12:30, cf. in 23:1 ἁπλῇ διανοίᾳ and 33:8 ἐξ ὅλης τῆς ἰσχύος?

μὴ ἀργοὺς μηδὲ παρειμένους: this is the aim of God's urgent appeal. It is a renewed answer to the question of 33:1, reinforced by the interjacent argumentation. At the same time it gets its full force from the example of the careless labourer in 34:1 who does not dare to see his employer face to face: the same will happen to slothful "Christians" at the judgment.

§ 5. The beginning of this verse belongs to the preceding sentence, as it again is an echo to vs. 1. If we do good works, will that be a reason for pride or boldness? No, says the author: our glory and frankness must be in Him.

τό καύχημα: this root is found only once in this epistle in 1 Clem. 13:1, a quotation which is also found in Paul, 1 Cor. 1:31. The writer uses this word as a current idea which does not need any explanation. As a matter of fact it is a very frequent word in the OT and in Paul (cf. Bultmann, in Kittel[54] III, p. 646-653). The Apostle has made an end to all self-glory of men, even of the pious men, Eph. 2:8-9, Phil. 3:3 ff., 1 Cor. 1:25-30. In the same line is Clement, expressing here the same thought as in 30:6 in other words (Bultmann, p. 653 takes it here, "dass die Frommen sich Gottes rühmen" and finds a liturgical sense in it, but this makes no sense here in this part of Clement's discourse and in combination with the next word).

ἡ παρρησία: used only in this chapter and 35:1 by Clem.; being introduced without further comments, it, too, seems to be a well-known expression to the readers. It is a familiar word in the NT (Bauer, col. 1051: freedom of speech, boldness, confidence), found in Paul, Hebrews and 1 John, see Eph. 3:12, 1 Tim. 3:13, Hebr. 10:35 "Cast not away therefore your boldness, which has great recompense of reward", 3:6 together with καύχημα: "whose (Christ) house are we, if we hold fast our boldness and the glorying of our hope firm unto the end", 1 John 3:21, 5:14 and with a strong eschatological note 2:28 "abide in Him; that if He shall be manifested, we may have boldness and not be ashamed before

Him at His coming". Here it means that we are confident in view of the judgment, just as the good labourer, not because of our own works, but because we have put our trust in Him. I am not sure that Knopf is right in maintaining that this παρρησία has nothing to do with faith (ad 34:1). The whole history of the word in the NT, into which we cannot enter at present, shows that it is only through faith that the Christian "parrhèsia" is obtained. Our author who is always fighting against human pride and arrogance[55] cuts them off here once again. This is the only way of not being ashamed in the end[56].

What should we do? Be *submissive to His will*, cf. 33:8 and the opposite 36:8: the enemies who will be subjected are they "who resist His will" (= 61:1). Clement sees this will revealed in the harmony of the creation, ch. 19-21, in the glory God gave to some men (32:3), in the work of redemption (32:4, 49:6). Here it is of course to do good works, as is clear from 33:8 as conclusion of the preceding chapter. ὑποτάσσω is a very favourite stem in Clement[57].

καταναοήσωμεν: Lightfoot paraphrased this by "only the eye and ear of faith are needed to recall the sight and sound of these celestial choirs" (see p. 329 above). This is far beyond the mark. Liddell-Scott, p. 902b: "to observe well, to perceive, to consider"; Behm, in Kittel IV, p. 970-972, says: "das aufmerksame Beschauen eines Gegenstandes..... Durchweg vermittelt diese sinnliche Wahrnehmung oder Anchauung Eindrücke, die zu Anknüpfungspunkten für die Gewinnung wichtiger religiöser oder ethischer Einsichten werden....Im Hb gehört καταναοέω zu den Verbalbegriffen, die, imperativisch oä verwendet, den Lesern Pflichten, die aus ihrem Christsein erwachsen, eindrücklich machen". This holds good for 1 Clement also, see his use of the verb in 24:1, 32:1, 37:2 and 47:5, the last three instances of merely human conditions! So it can be translated always as "let us attentively look".—The construction here is an ordinary case of *prolepsis* with a verb of observation, Blass-Debrunner, § 476, 2.

πλῆθος τῶν ἀγγέλων: the early Christians have taken over the late Jewish conceptions of an innumerable host of angels, see: W. Bousset, *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter*[3], Tübingen 1926, p. 320-331 and G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, Cambridge (Mass.) 1932, vol. I, p. 405-411.

λειτουργοῦσιν: the first word that has a cultic connotation in this passage, = "dienen und zwar im Kultus" (Knopf). That is true to a certain extent, see the important article of H. Strathmann-R. Meyer, in Kittel IV, p. 221-239, who give ample evidence from profane and biblical Greek. But to determine the meaning here two facts should not be overlooked: 1) Clement does not say: who serve *Him*, but: who serve *His*

will; 2) the word is also used for "jede Dienstleistung überhaupt" (p. 224); this is also found in the NT (p. 233-234) and this mode of speech was known to Clement. Sometimes he takes this word in the OT meaning 32:2, 40; sometimes it has a more limited, ecclesiastical meaning, ch. 41-44, but very often it has a wider scope: the obedient service of God in general, cf. 8:1 οἱ λειτουργοὶ τῆς χάριτος 9:2, 4; 20:10 of the winds. So it is here: the angels serve the will of God, for the conception of the "will of God" is the leading idea which makes him think of the angels as examples (the verb λειτουργεῖν might be due here to the following quotation just as παρεστῶτες). What is this will which is done by the angels?

§ 6. The usual answer to the question of the way in which the angels are an example for the "people of God" on earth is given by a reference to the liturgy. Unfortunately the writer says expressly: *for the Scripture says*! γάρ is always in Clement the foundation for the statement just made; it looks back[58]. λέγει γὰρ ἡ γραφή is found also in 23:3, 35:7, 42:5 and serves as an introduction to a literal quotation from the Bible (see G. Schrenk, in Kittel I, p. 750-754). Generally this fact is overlooked; Probst alone paid some attention to it, but disregarded it, because of the strange combination of texts, which is also found in the liturgy (see p. 327 above). For the relation of Clement's text to other forms, see the commentaries of Lightfoot and Knopf. The strange combination of Dan. 7:10 with Is. 6:3 has always been the corner stone of the liturgical interpretation. That would be cogent indeed, if there were not three arguments which make it really worthless: (i) Clement is saying *expressis verbis* that he is quoting from the OT[59]; he does not introduce it imperceptibly; (ii) this combination is not so strange, if one looks at Clement's use of the OT in general; in 23:3 he is quoting even an unknown apocryphon as Scripture, in 34:3 we have met another queer combination (see above, p. 336) and these are only two instances of a long array which are discussed by Wrede, p. 65-66[60] (written as long ago as 1891, so this fact could be known!); it might be, as Hatch has suggested, that Clement is under influence of a "book of testimonies", though that view was combatted by Wrede; (iii) Lightfoot (I, p. 388, note 1-p. 389) observed a difference between the text of Clement and all the liturgies, which speak of: *heaven and earth are full* etc.; but there is another important difference between Clement and the later liturgies, that is never mentioned: while Clement is using throughout the past tense, the liturgies are always using the present tense, as may be seen from the texts in: Brightman, *L.E.W.* p. 18, 50, 131-132, 284, 323 to give some examples (in the liturgies it always said: "we thank together with the angels", but this is not found in Clement whose text is much shorter). Why should Clement, if he actually quoted from the liturgy, have used this introductory formula and have changed

the tenses? Whatever may be the explanation of the similarity in the combination, it cannot be maintained that this argument alone outbalances the contra-arguments.—From this quotation it is not yet clear in which way the angels serve the will of God; the answer will be found in the next paragraph.

Something more should be said about the quotation of Dan. 7:10 which forms the first half of the "proof-text". The usual interpretation passes over this half, only making some remarks about its textual form which is also found elsewhere in the churchfathers (Lightfoot, Knopf) and jumping directly to the latter half, the "Sanctus" of Is. 6:3. This is only possible on one condition, viz. that Clement is depending here upon the liturgy, but that is exactly the question! At any rate, the text itself is important enough and it is not advisable to suppress it without a word. The connection with the preceding verse 34:5 in the two words λειτουργοῦσι and παρεστῶτες is strong. This shows that this text was not accidental to Clement, but formed part of his argument. Besides that, the innumerable number of the angels is an explanation of πλῆθος τῶν ἀγγέλων. When we look at the text of Daniel itself, something more may be found. It is written there: "a fiery stream issued and came forth from before Him: thousand thousands ministered unto Him, and ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him: the judgment was set and the books were opened". This is part of a description of the last judgment, exactly the theme Clement is dealing with. Here the same idea of recompense: the books were opened, cf. Apoc. 20:12, the same expression and the addition: "the dead were judged out of the things that were written in the books, according to their works" (for "books" see G. Schrenk, in Kittel I, p. 619-620). Clement is moving in the same sphere of ideas, see the parallel in vs. 3 with Apoc. 22:12. This passage of Daniel has had a great influence: in vs. 13 the great text of the "Son of Man" coming with the clouds of heaven (quoted in the NT: Mc. 13:26 parr.; 14:62 parr.; the title "Son of Man" and the "clouds"; the "fiery stream" in vs. 10, a standing motive in early-christian eschatological descriptions, see the important material brought together by C. M. Edsman, *Le baptême de feu*, Uppsala 1940). So this text was not taken at haphazard by Clement, but belonged to the stock of eschatological tradition (cf. also Apoc. 5:11, and Is. 6:3 in Apoc. 4:8). And though Clement is using only one element, the whole setting should not be overlooked.

§ 7. The survey in the first part of this paper will have made it sufficiently clear that this is the *cardo quaestionis*. "Wir werden hier mit einem Schlage in die zum Gottesdienste versammelte Gemeinde geführt" (Knopf); we find here "den Lobgesang der Engel, in den auch die Gläubigen einstimmen", followed by quotation of vs. 7-8 (Wetter, op.

cit., p. 20). This interpretation is suggested by translations like this: "und auch wir ....." (Knopf, Harnack) or: "and when we come together in unity, let us likewise ...." (Brilioth). This interpretation assumes a close connection between vs. 6a and 7, a parallelism on which the whole conception of the early existence of the "Sanctus" in the liturgy is built. This is only true ..... (*sit venia verbo*) on superficial reading. It would be true, if βοάω meant "einstimmen" and were used in an absolute form, or if there were a word for "likewise" (οὕτως or ὡσαύτως) which is not there, but only smuggled in "pour besoin de la cause". And strange though it may be, the most important phrase is always left unexplained, viz. the beginning of the sentence!

καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν: on the use of οὖν we have spoken on p. 337 above and shown that there is always a kind of gap before, that it takes up a certain idea of the preceding passage to make a fresh start and to turn to another idea. It does not look back, but ahead, referring to something of the leading thought in the previous part. That this holds good in this case may be seen from two other instances: 32:3-4 πάντες οὖν ἐδοξάσθησαν καὶ ἐμεγαλύνθησαν οὐ διὰ αὐτῶν ἢ τῶν ἔργων αὐτῶν ἢ τῆς δικαιοπραγίας ἧς κατειργάσαντο, ἀλλὰ διὰ τοῦ θελήματος αὐτοῦ, (4) καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν, διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ κληθέντες, οὐ δι' ἑαυτῶν δικαιούμεθα οὐδὲ διὰ τῆς ἡμετέρας σοφίας ..... ἢ ἔργων ὧν κατειργασάμεθα ..... ἀλλὰ διὰ τῆς πίστεως, δι' ἧς πάντας τοὺς ἀπ' αἰῶνος ὁ παντοκράτωρ θεὸς ἐδικαίωσεν. Because the principal verbs δοξάζω and δικαιόω contain quite a different thought there is no parallelism here, but the point of contact is διὰ θελήματος αὐτοῦ in vs. 3 and vs. 4, which excludes the works of our own. Even more striking is 56:1 (which is left unexplained by Lightfoot and Knopf): καὶ ἡμεῖς οὖν ἐντύχωμεν περὶ τῶν ἔν τινι παραπτώματι ὑπαρχόντων, ὅπως δοθῇ αὐτοῖς ἐπιείκεια ..... εἰς τὸ εἶξαι αὐτοὺς μὴ ἡμῖν, ἀλλὰ τοῦ θελήματι τοῦ θεοῦ.

Here is no parallelism whatever; the author has told from sacred and profane history how many people have sacrificed themselves to save the rest of their people; and it is clear that he cannot say here: "so likewise we will sacrifice ourselves and go away". What he does say is: "having this in mind, let us pray that to them who are in any transgression, forebearance and humility might be given to yield not unto us, but to the will of God"; it is this self-effacing mood which lived in the great examples from history which forms the point of contact (expressed here in the favourite words of Clement, see Kwa Joe Liang, l.c. *passim*); based upon this thought he brings in the new idea: the transgressors must become obedient to the will of God.

What is in 34:7 the point of contact on which the new thought is based? That cannot be vs. 6 or the "Sanctus", for this quotation has no

independant value in the discourse, but is only cited in proof of what was said in vs. 5. We have seen, that the angels are set as an example before men, because they serve the will of God. The answer to many of the previous questions is found in the next two words ἐν ὁμονοίᾳ: this again is one of the "keywords" of the letter, being used no less than 14 times (the letter itself is characterized in 63:2 as ἔντευξις περὶ εἰρήνης καὶ ὁμονοίας) and this combination is also found in 20:10-11 and 60:4; it is three times found in ch. 20 on the harmony in nature, where everything is obedient to the will of God[61]; it is introduced in the writer's paraphrase of 1 Cor. 13 (49:5, cf. 50:5) and in 30:3 the readers are admonished: "let us clothe ourselves in concord" (see p. 335 above). It is a mistaken view to think that Clement is using here a Stoic idea; he is writing and stressing this point, because something has gone wrong in the church of Corinth, because the unity is broken there[62]. Nature shows us ch. 20, what is the will of God: harmony. This is the same thought underlying the verses 5 and 6: the angels who form *so many multitudes* (therefore: τὸ πᾶν πλῆθος), serve all the will of God, because they do not cry in confusion, but *unanimously*; this state of affairs is revealed in scripture by Dan. 7:10, speaking of the multitudes, and Is. 6:3, speaking of unanimity and concord (now it becomes also clear why Dan. 7:10, which is so closely linked up with vs. 5 and which is always more or less superfluous in the usual line of interpretation, has been introduced here and is an indispensable element).

ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες: since Probst it is always suggested more or less openly that this means: to go to the eucharistic service. Lietzmann wrote without further comment: "der technische Ausdruck für die gottesdienstliche Versammlung" (*Messe und Herrenmahl*, p. 167, n. 2) which means in the context of his book: the eucharist. In the same way Knopf, loc. cit., referring to 1 Cor. 5:4, 11:20, Act. 1:15, 2:1, 44, Ignatius *Eph.* 13:1 and *Did.* 14, says that σύναξις in later ecclesiastical Greek was the name for the "liturgische Gottesdienst". That σύναξις got a technical sense in later Greek is true, see Brightman, *L.E.W.*, p. 602, s.v. But I am not sure that this gives much help. What would Clement and his contemporaries have thought—assuming that these words had this technical meaning—in reading in their Bible LXX Ps. 2:2 οἱ ἄρχοντες συνήχθησαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτο κατὰ τοῦ κυρίου or Jos. 9:2 συνήλθοσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ἐκπολεμῆσαι Ἰησοῦν καὶ Ἰσραήλ, viz. the kings of Canaan; was this also a coming to the eucharist?! And these are no isolated instances. Let us look at the separate parts. συνάγω for persons is the ordinary Greek for "to bring together" for deliberation or festivity (Liddell-Scott, vol. II, 1. 1691b). ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό: Blass-Debrunner, 233, 1 "zusammen, beisammen"; Bauer, col. 206: "an demselben Ort, zusammen" (quotes from

Hesychius = ὁμοῦ, ἐπὶ τὸν αὐτὸν τόπον); in the papyri sometimes "in total"[63]; in Josephus, *Antiq.* III 236 "at the same time". Joh. Weiss, *Erster Korintherbrief*, Göttingen 1910, ad 1 Cor. 11:20 gives two references to classical Greek. In LXX "at the same place" Exod. 26:9, Jos. 9:2, 11:5, 2 Sam. 10:15, Ps. 102:23, *Sus.* 14 *Theod*: the elders ἐξελθόντες διεχωρίσθησαν ἀπ' ἀλλήλων, καὶ ἀνακάμψαντες ἦλθον ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ ..... καὶ τότε κοινῇ, "to bring together what is separated" 3 Macc. 3:1 the Jews from Alexandria and from the country, or "at the same time" Deut. 22:10; *Test. XII Patr. Napht.* 6:6 the sons of Jacob are separated, but Juda and Levi ἦσαν ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό = were at the same place. The same holds good for the NT; besides the instances given before, see Matth. 22:34, Luc. 17:35, Act. 2:47 (a very awkward place, see Lake-Cadbury's note in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, London 1933, vol. IV a.l.), 1 Cor. 7:5. In Act. 2:1 one can hardly say that this meeting was a eucharist! In the "Apost. Fathers" it sometimes has a eucharistic note, but one derived from its context; at any rate it can always be translated by "at the same place". It is curious to see opposites of it: Blass-Debr. referred to an inscription, where ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό is used contra κατὰ μέρος; in Barnabas 4:10 μὴ καθ' ἑαυτοὺς ἐνδύνοντες μονάζετε ..... ἀλλ' ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συνερχόμενοι, Ign. *Magn.* 7:1 opp. ἰδίᾳ, the consequence being "one prayer, one supplication, one mind, one hope", *Eph.* 13:1 σπουδάζετε οὖν πυκνότερον συνέρχεσθαι εἰς εὐχαριστίαν θεοῦ καὶ εἰς δόξαν, ὅταν γὰρ πυκνῶς ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε, καθαιροῦνται αἱ δυνάμεις τοῦ σατανᾶ καὶ λύεται ὁ ὄλεθρος αὐτοῦ ἐν τῇ ὁμονοίᾳ ὑμῶν τῆς πίστεως (NB: here the connection with "concord"! Satan is trying to destroy the unity, his world is confusion), cf. *Philad.* 6:2 ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ γίνεσθε ἐν ἀμερίστῳ καρδίᾳ[64]. It always means that the local separation is removed, the unity is restored. So it is also the case in Paul, 1 Cor. 11:20, the proof-text of the "technical" meaning; it should be translated in this way: "the fact itself that you meet together does not mean to eat the Lord's supper", and Plummer in his commentary (*I.C.C.*) quite rightly observes: "it emphasizes the contrast between the external union and the internal dissension". These examples give sufficient light for the use in 1 Clem. 34: 7a: *therefore, because the multitudes of the angels sing in one choir their song, as the Scripture says, we too gathered in concord in the same meeting and not making separations like the dissenters in the Corinthian church.* This is the basic idea borrowed from the preceding sentences, on which he builds a new thought (cf. above p. 342 f.), expressed by the principal verb βοήσωμεν. Of course Clement is speaking of a gathering of the Church, but it cannot be derived from his words that it was an eucharistic service. συνειδήσει: no really satisfactory explanation of this word has been offered so far. It is certainly not the same as "in a pure conscience" (1:3, 41:1, 45:7 and the elaborate note of C. Spicq, *Les Épitres Pastorales*, Paris

1945, p. 29-38), though older commentaries took it in this way (see: A. C. Duker-W. C. van Manen, *Oud-christelijke Letterkunde*, Amsterdam 1871, I, p. 194-195 and Lightfoot, II, p. 105). Since Clement uses the expression "good conscience", it is not clear why he should have dropped the word "good" here. Lightfoot and Knopf saw this difficulty and referring to Eccl. 10:20 καί γε ἐν συνειδήσει σου βασιλέα μὴ καταράσῃ translated it by "with intentness of heart" (Lightfoot) and "innere Anteilnahme" (Knopf). Harnack, *Einführung*, p. 31, 113: "seelisch", while in his commentary of 1876 a.l. he translated it by "conscientia ducti" without further comments. Bauer, col. 1308-1309: "pflichtbewusst, mit Gewissenhaftigkeit", as it is found in some later papyri. Unfortunately the word is not discussed by L. Sanders, *l'Hellénisme de saint Clément de Rome et le Paulinisme*, Louvain 1943. Anyhow the variety of translations shows the uncertainty of explanation quite sufficiently.—In trying to find out its meaning here we start from the way in which Clement has phrased the sentence (in passing we may say that the difficult text 1 Clem. 2:4 does not give us any help except for the fact that Clement's use of the word συνείδησις is not covered by our "conscience"). We notice that there is a difference between the two datives, the former ὁμονοίᾳ being introduced by ἐν, the latter absolute; that they stand on different places and that the second one behind συναχθέντες is likely to have some connection with that word. Therefore it seems to be wrong to translate with Knopf: "einmütig und andächtig versammelt". The facts can be easily explained in this way: ἐν denotes a certain state or mood (examples in Bauer, col. 429, 4d); συνάγομαι is sometimes used with the full passive force, at other times as a reflexive (Bauer, col. 1301-1302 s.v.), but since it is followed here by an absolute dative (= *dativus causae*, Blass-Debrunner, 196; in Clem. e.g. 6:1, 28:1), it must be taken here in the former sense (contrary to Matth. 22:34, Act. 4:26): *in concord being brought together by* ..... (and not: *coming together*, which leaves the dative unexplained!). But what means συνείδησις? This word has become overburdened in the course of centuries, "conscience" getting the meaning of a judging instance in the inward man. But it cannot have this notion here, for in that case we should have expected the word ἡμῶν which is missing, συνειδήσει standing absolutely. Since Clement's letter gives no further light, we may turn to the NT. In this connection it would be out of place to trace all shades of meaning the word has there. But we want to draw attention to two texts, where the word is used in a rather peculiar way and where the translation "conscience" is not satisfactory either. In Rom. 13:5 Paul says: διὸ ἀνάγκη ὑποτάσσεσθαι, οὐ μόνον διὰ τὴν ὀργὴν ἀλλὰ καὶ διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν[65]. This is the conclusion of a passage (13:1-5) which deals with subjection under worldly authorities (ἐξουσίαι)[66], which are set by the order of God

(vs. 1, 2. cf. 1 Clem. 61:1). Those who do the good will be praised by the authorities, but the evildoers will be punished (here happens on the level of the earth the same that has been mentioned about the final judgment, Rom. 2:6-9), vs. 3-4. There is an antithetical parallelism that may be paraphrased in this way: 4a the civil power is an instrument of God to thee, who knowest His will and therefore how to do the good, to reach the good, his blessing (cf. 8:28); 4b the civil power is also a revenging instrument of God to the evil-doer who transgresses and rejects the will of God, to reveal His wrath[67]. To this antithesis corresponds vs. 5: therefore ye must needs be in subjection, not only for a negative reason, because the coming wrath inspires terror, but also for a positive reason διὰ τὴν συνείδησιν. If we see this train of thought, we notice that it corresponds to doing good works; so συνείδησις cannot have any other meaning than: *compliance with the will of God*[68] (συνειδέναι σὺν τῷ θεῷ), who asks good works, *i.e.* submission.—The same holds good in the other text, viz. 1 Petr. 2:19, where the hard expression διὰ συνείδησιν θεοῦ is used[69]. Though spoken to Christian houseslaves and not to the Christians in general, the whole passage 2:18-20 shows a striking similarity with Rom. 13:1-5 (to be in subjection; glory; what is acceptable with God; doing good or evil). Here is found the same sort of antithetical parallelism and the same connection between "doing good" and the συνείδησις. We paraphrase the sentence in this way: "this is acceptable with God, if a man, while doing good because of his being in compliance with the will of God[70], endureth griefs, suffering wrongfully, because his well-doing should have been praised and remunerated and not punished".—When now after this long digression we return to 1 Clem. 34:7, we are struck again by the similarity of themes (vs. 4 good works, cf. the note p. 336 ff.; vs. 5 to be in subjection; the will of God; praise, see 30:6-7![71]) and find that the translation of συνείδησις given for Rom. 13:5, 1 Petr. 2:19 gives an excellent sense! It fits in exactly in the whole context.

Translation of vs. 7a (based upon the previous notes and disregarding for the moment that this clause is a dependent one): *therefore in concord are we, too, brought together by the compliance with the will of God (which requires subjection).* ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος: good Greek expression, Liddell-Scott, II, p. 1649a, s.v. I 3e, cf. Pap. Giessen I 36, 12 (161 B.C): αἱ τέτταρες λέγονται ἐξ ἑνὸς στόματος γρα (μματεῖ) Νεχούθει[72]. The many members of the church must show their concord and unity in this way.

βοήσωμεν πρὸς αὐτόν sc. θεόν: let us cry unto Him (the Lord). It may be observed, though it has never been done by the advocates of the "liturgical" interpretation, that βοάω is also found in the liturgies connected with the "Sanctus", so in St. James (*L.E.W.*, p. 50) ᾄδοντα βοῶντα δοξολογοῦντα, κεκραγότα καὶ λέγοντα and the other texts, referred

to on p. 340 (the "Clementine Liturgy" *L.E.W.*, p. 18 has not this full form, but βοώσαις) and that it is a favourite word for acclamations (E. Peterson, *Heis Theos*, Göttingen 1926, p. 191-192; Liddell-Scott, I, p. 319b). Unfortunately this exegesis is untenable for two reasons: 1) βοάω does not stand alone for itself, but is determined by πρὸς αὐτόν and εἰς τό κτλ; 2) in the text of Is. 6:3 the "Sanctus" is not directed to God, but "one cried unto another", quoted in St. James, *L.E.W.*, p. 50. βοάω = *to cry aloud*, is often found in the Septuagint which so deeply influenced the language of Clement[73], in combination with πρὸς θεόν. When Bauer says: "v. Gebet als Rufen zu Gott" (col. 240), this explanation is too unexpressive, for it does not bring out the full force of the combination; far more satisfactory is the treatment by E. Stauffer, in Kittel I, p. 624-627, though an independent investigation of the LXX on this point has led the present writer to a sharper definition which will shed light on 1 Clem. 34:7. The most characteristic text is 2 Chron. 20:9: ἐὰν ἐπέλθῃ ἐφ' ἡμᾶς κακά, ῥομφαία, κρίσις, θάνατος, λιμός, στησόμεθα ἐναντίον ..... σου ..... καὶ βοησόμεθα πρὸς σὲ ἀπὸ τῆς θλίψεως, καὶ ἀκούσῃ καὶ σώσεις. The verb is always used for the *cries of people who are much oppressed and in great afflictions and then call unto the Lord; it might be that He hears them and brings salvation, but one cannot be certain of that* (cf. Hab. 1:2 ἕως τίνος, κύριε, κράξομαι, καὶ οὐ μὴ εἰσακούσῃς; βοήσομαι πρὸς σὲ ἀδικούμενος, καὶ οὐ σώσεις and 1 Sam. 8:18). Histories illustrating the force of this "crying" are found in Ex. 15:25, 17:4, Num. 12:13, Jdg. 6:7, 10:12, 1 Sam. 12:8 oppression in Egypt, cf. Ex. 2:23, 12:10 later oppressions. In 2 Chron. 14:11 and Judith 9:1 it is followed by a long prayer which is very significant. In 1 Sam. 10:12 and Is. 46:7 it is used to demonstrate the impotence of the idols (other instances are found in Deut. 15:9, 1 Sam. 7:8-9, 15:11, 2 Chron. 13:14-15, Is. 58:9, Lam. 2:18, 3:8, Hos. 7:14, Joel 1:19; it is very strange to notice that it is not to be found in the book of Psalms, though the Hebrew roots translated by βοάω are there too). One who "cries" calls for a βοηθός (see: Stauffer, p. 625, n. 6) which may be illustrated by an example from the secular level Deut. 22:27: a damsel that is forced in the field is not guilty, ὅτι ἐν τῷ ἀγρῷ εὗρεν αὐτήν, ἐβοήσεν ἡ νεᾶνις ..... καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ βοηθήσων αὐτῇ. This βοηθός is often found in the OT to denote God, especially in the Psalms (the article of F. Büchsel, in Kittel I, p. 627 is quite insufficient; see the Concordance of Hatch-Redpath, s.v.).—Returning now to 1 Clement we notice that the verb is used nowhere else in the letter, so that there is no comparative material, but that application of the LXX meaning gives an excellent sense. The question whether the writer and his readers are in a state of affliction, may be answered in the affirmative. The letter was written shortly after a period of persecution (1:1, Knopf, l.c.). The church is living in a foreign

country (inscription, with Lightfoot's note) and this implies a dangerous situation. Besides that, we remember the strong eschatological note of the whole passage (p. 336) which is confirmed by the sequence. The end is nearing (ch. 23:5, 28: 1 ff.!) and then the danger is extremely great that one by running counter to the will of God, *i.e.* the sedition in the church, will be condemned, the more because of the "wiles of the Adversary" (very important in this respect is ch. 51 with the example of the rioters against Moses who were damned, cf. the commentaries.) Compare also the prayer in 59:4 where God is called the "Helper": τὸν ἐπόπτην ἀνθρωπίνων ἔργων, τὸν τῶν κινδυνευόντων βοηθόν, τὸν τῶν ἀπηλπισμένων σωτῆρα (cf. vs. 3; the same substantive for Christ in 36:1). In this dangerous situation they must be in compliance with the will of God and cry[74] for His help to be saved, for even by good works one does not work his own salvation (32:4 and 7:1).—As to the syntactical construction, we notice that βοήσωμεν is the *principal verb* of the sentence and is standing parallel to ὑποτασσώμεθα.

ἐκτενῶς: Probst, Lightfoot and Knopf referred here again to the later liturgies; it is "ein technischer Ausdruck der Liturgie", says Knopf who gives a number of illustrations. They look very impressive, especially if one adds what is said by Brightman, *L.E.W.*, p. 596 s.v., who tells us that it is so technical that it has become a loan-word in other languages. He describes it as "an 'extended' or prolonged prayer, a litany of several suffrages". But it is not very hopeful for the "Sanctus"-theory to see that this technical use is always applied to other prayers but never to the "Sanctus". The argument from the liturgies would carry some weight if it was not found anywhere else and if it were not late. We must ask: is the "non-liturgical" usage to be explained from the liturgy or can the liturgical usage be explained from ordinary Greek? There cannot be the slightest doubt that the latter alternative is right—Clement uses the same root in five more places, only once connected with prayer 59:2 αἰτησόμεθα ἐκτενῆ τὴν δέησιν καὶ ἱκεσίαν ποιούμενοι. Twice the adjective is connected with "gentleness": 58:2 ἐν ταπεινοφροσύνῃ μετ' ἐκτενοῦς ἐπιεικείας and 62:2 εἰρήνῃ μετὰ ἐκτενοῦς ἐπιεικείας. The substantive is used twice in connection with good works and the obedience to God's commandments: 33:1 σπεύσωμεν μετὰ ἐκτενείας καὶ προθυμίας πᾶν ἔργον ἀγαθὸν ἐπιτελεῖν and 37:1 στρατευσώμεθα ..... μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενείας ἐν τοῖς ..... προστάγμασιν αὐτοῦ. No special liturgical meaning comes out. All instances can be covered by the translation: "earnest, strenuous, eager, zealous". It is an ordinary Greek word (Liddell-Scott, I, p. 521 b, s.v.). In the NT it is found in combination with love (1 Petr. 1:22 and 4:8) and with prayer (Luc. 22:44 Jesus in Gethsemane, which is certainly not liturgical, and Acts 12:5 with variants). It always denotes the intensity and fervour accompanying a

certain action (see H. Fuchs, in Kittel II, p. 461-462 and Bauer, col. 406-407). The adverb is also found in the LXX, six times and "bezeichnet ....die Innbrust des Gebets" (Fuchs, p. 461) in 4 instances. Very interesting is one passage from the book of Judith, from which we quoted another significant example before (p. 347), because it most certainly influenced the author who was much impressed by the example of the courageous Judith (55:4-5): on hearing of the actions of Holofernes 4:9 καὶ ἀνεβόησαν πᾶς ἀνὴρ Ἰσραὴλ πρὸς τὸν θεὸν ἐν ἐκτενείᾳ μεγάλῃ; this is repeated in slightly different phrasing in vs. 12: all inhabitants, wearing mourning garments, fell down in front of the temple καὶ ἐβόησαν πρὸς τὸν θεὸν Ἰσραὴλ ὁμοθυμαδὸν ἐκτενῶς, τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι εἰς διαρπαγὴν κτλ. The translation: "with great fervour" is well-suited here and so it is in 1 Clem. 34:7. It also explains perfectly the texts adduced by Knopf without requiring to be labelled "technischer Ausdruck der Liturgie". This can be said only by disregarding the facts.

εἰς τό + infinitive: denotes consequence or aim (Blass-Debrunner, 402, 2; Bauer, col. 379 "sodass", "damit"). J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*, Edinburgh 1908, vol. I[3], p. 218 quotes with assent Westcott's explanation of Hebr. 5:1: "indicates the more remote result aimed at or reached". That is also true for 1 Clement, the most remarkable instance being 65:1 ἀναπέμψατε πρὸς ἡμᾶς, ὅπως ..... ἡμῖν εἰρήνην καὶ ὁμόνοιαν ἀπαγγέλλωσιν, εἰς τὸ τάχιον καὶ ἡμᾶς χαρῆναι περὶ τῆς εὐσταθείας ὑμῶν: the first thing is the return of the messengers with the good news; the second result in the same line will be the joy in Rome. An illuminating parallel is also 56:1 ἐντύχωμεν ..... ὅπως δοθῇ αὐτοῖς ἐπιείκεια καὶ ταπεινοφροσύνη εἰς τὸ εἴξαι αὐτοὺς κτλ. It is a prayer which asks for gentleness and humility in the hearts of the transgressors in order that they may yield; this comes in the second place, though it is the final result aimed at. Other examples may be found in 2:4, 50:5, 60:3, 61:1 which all show the same characteristic. In this light we offer the following paraphrase of this part of the sentence: *let us cry with fervour to God to send us a helper in our present precarious situation in order that we may be saved and be* μετόχοι ... τῶν .... ἐπαγγελιῶν (this end which is expressed by εἰς τὸ + inf. being not the first contents, but the final result lying in the same line, resulting when the first prayer is obtained). μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων ἐπαγγελιῶν αὐτοῦ = "in order that we may become partakers or shareholders of His great and glorious promises". cf. 35:4 and below p. 353. For μέτοχος + gen. of contents, see H. Hanse in Kittel II, p. 830-832; in the NT it is a favourite of Hebr., e.g. 3:1 and 14. μέγας καὶ ἔνδοξος: comp. 19:2, 23:2, 45:7, 58:1 for similar combinations, all speaking of something reflecting the wonderful glory of God; see Kittel in Kittel II, p. 257.—ἐπαγγελία: Clement uses

this root twice in speaking of Abraham and his posterity (10:2, 32:2) being restricted to the OT period; here it has an eschatological meaning in accordance with the beginning of the chapter vs. 3 and with the sequence. This second sense is also found in 26:1 = the resurrection, in 27:1 "with this hope therefore (of the coming resurrection) let our souls be bound unto Him that is faithful in His promises and that is righteous in His judgments" ("hope", the rest of the chapter and 28:1 all pointing to the great and final future, which also qualifies the word "promises" here) and in 35:4 which will be discussed later (p. 353 below). In this respect 1 Clem. is in the same line as Hebrews who has also this double use of the word "promise" (see the article by J. Schniewind/G. Friedrich in Kittel III, p. 573-583, especially p. 580-582). Hebr. speaks of the "better promises" of the New Covenant (8:6) and of "the promise of the eternal inheritance" for the Christians (9:15). While the author *ad Hebraeos* gives an exhortation to patience "that having done the will of God ye may receive the promise" (10:36, cf. 4:1), because it is a time of persecution and slackening (10:22-39), Clement admonishes his readers to do the will of God by unity and submission. They face different difficulties for the proper Christian life, but their basis and outlook is the same. What do these promises contain? The answer is given in vs. 8.

§ 8. The explanation of the preceding "promises", λέγει γάρ see *ad* vs. 6.

a. The subject of a favorite introductory formula in 1 Clem. is generally "the scripture" as in vs. 6[75] or the Holy Spirit (13:1), the Holy Word (56:6), Wisdom (57:3), one of the holy men of the OT such as Abraham, Moses or David (17:2, 6, 18:2, 52:3) or the Lord (10:2, but cf. 10:6 where it must be "the Scripture", for the Lord is spoken of in the third person; 36:5). The author naturally does not make any distinction, in each case referring to a saying that received its authority from divine inspiration.

b. Where did the author read it? Paul has a practically identical "prooftext" in 1 Cor. 2:9, a letter which was known to Clement. But it is quite improbable that Clement quoted from Paul, because the texts have different forms: Paul ἃ ὀφθαλμός/Clem. ὀφθαλμός; Paul: ὁ θεός, missing in Clement; Paul τοῖς ἀγαπῶσιν/Clem. τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν (that this is the true reading is absolutely certain from the sequence 35:3-4). This third difference may be influenced by Is. 64:4. The much-debated question of the origin of this "quotation" (either from a conflation of Is. 64:4 and 65:16-17 or from the lost apocryphal *Apocalypse of Elijah*, as is suggested by Origen) will be found in the commentaries on 1 Cor. 2:9 and 1 Clem. 34:8, see also Th. Zahn, *Geschichte des neutestamentlichen Kanons*, Erlangen—Leipzig 1892, vol. II 2, p. 802-810; E. Schürer, *Geschichte des*

jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi[4], Leipzig 1910, vol. III, p. 361-365, W. Bauer, *Das Johannesevangelium*[3], Tübingen 1933, p. 4-5. It is often quoted in early Christian literature in various forms both by ecclesiastical and heretical authors (see a list in Ph. Bachmann, *Der erste Brief des Paulus an die Korinther*[2], Leipzig 1910, p. 127, n. 2). It may safely be said that the "orthodox" writers took it all as *describing the glories of the future state* when God's reign which transcends all human imagination, which surpasses all the blessings the Christian experiences in this life, shall be absolute. It is interesting to compare the Jewish exegesis of Is. 64:4, as given in H. L. Strack-P. Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum N.T. aus Talmud und Midrasch*, München 1926, vol. III, p. 328-329 from Sanhedrin, fol. 99a: "R. Chijja b. Abba (um 280) hat gesagt, R. Jochanan (†279) habe gesagt: Alle Propheten haben nur auf die Tage des Messias geweissagt (d.h. alle ihre Weissagungen gehen nicht über die messian. Zeit hinaus, sondern werden in dieser ihre Erfüllung finden); aber für die zukünftige Welt (die auf die Tage des Messias folgt) gilt: ‚Ein Auge hat nicht gesehen, o Gott, ausser dir, was er (Gott) bereitet dem, der seiner harrt' " (according to Strack-Billerbeck, who give a number of parallel traditions, this interpretation is old). Here a remarkable distinction between the "days of the Messiah" and the "future world" (also found elsewhere among the rabbis, Strack-Billerbeck, op. cit., vol. IV 2, p. 799-976); for the Christians the "days of the Messiah" have come in Jesus Christ, in whom the prophecies found their fulfilment, but the great future is still to be expected and that is spoken of in that famous saying. This is also the idea of 1 Clement (see below p. 353). It does not seem improbable to the present writer that Clement found it in some apocryphon which had made use of material of Isaiah, as is also done by Enoch, since apocryphal quotations are found elsewhere in this epistle (see p. 336 above and 8:3, 17:6, 46:2 and the extremely important eschatological saying 23:4-5).

c. We could leave the question here, and pass on to the explanation of τοῖς ὑπομένουσιν αὐτόν, had not the "liturgical" interpretation thought that this quotation gave special strength to this theory. Of Knopf's loose way of using the word "liturgy" in this connection while disregarding the historical facts something has been said already on p. 330 above; he did not bring any special contribution beyond that of Drews. If we look critically at the material brought together by Drews (p. 161-164), it is immediately clear that this theory has not one, but two Achilles' heels: 1) the liturgies which quote it, always give the Pauline and not the Clementine form, so they obviously culled it from the apostle (this was seen already by Lightfoot, I, p. 390 note, though he did not take it seriously); 2) it is only found in some (later) liturgies and even then in quite different

places, so it is obvious that it did not belong to the original "Bestand" of the liturgies but was introduced by various authors for embellishment (a fact which can be seen at many places in the growth of the formularies). It was found before that this text was used by many early authors since it was so well-suited to indicate the future all-transcending blessedness, without any "liturgical" tone (so there is no reason to see a special connection with the liturgy in 1 Clem. 34). It belonged to the fixed material which filled the "locus de novissimis" and was for that reason introduced into the liturgies at suitable places. In this way, which is in complete agreement with the whole tenor of 1 Clem. 34, all the facts can be explained in a self-evident manner, and one is not obliged to have recourse to the phantastic solution of the riddle of its use in different liturgical contexts which was offered by Drews "pour besoin de la cause ...mauvaise". At any rate *an argument in favour of the "liturgical" interpretation cannot be derived from it*, especially because it is nowhere found connected with the "Sanctus".

d. "The great and glorious promises which surpass all human imagination have been prepared for those who await Him with patience"[76]. ὑπομένω is the translation of Hebrew words that denote "to hope", "to live in keen expectation", "to hold out" or "to endure". In the NT it has the same notions and is directed towards God, awaiting Him, or towards the world, "das *standhafte Aushalten* des Christen unter den Schwierigkeiten und Glaubensproben der gegenwärtigen schlimmen Weltzeit". It is one of the words which characterize the whole Christian existence, as is explained in the excellent article by F. Hauck, in Kittel IV, p. 585-593. This holds also good for 1 Clement. In 5:5, 7 Peter and Paul are called examples of patience who endured all kind of jealousy, in 45:8 those who patiently endured are OT worthies who received eternal reward. This must also be the signature of the present Christian life as it is the ideal which Clement preaches, as appears from 62:2 περὶ γὰρ πίστεως καὶ μετανοίας καὶ γνησίας ἀγάπης καὶ ἐγκρατείας καὶ σωφροσύνης καὶ ὑπομονῆς πάντα τόπον ἐφηλαφήσαμεν and practically the same catalogue in 64 πίστιν, φόβον, εἰρήνην, ὑπομονὴν καὶ μακροθυμίαν, ἐγκράτειαν, ἁγνείαν καὶ σωφροσύνην. In Titus 2:2 it is mentioned together with "faith and love", cf. also 1 Tim. 6:11 and 2 Tim. 3:10, 2:12 εἰ ὑπομένομεν, καὶ συμβασιλεύσομεν (in the Pastoral Epistles, which have the stress on "good works" with Clement in common, see the references of Bihlmeyer, p. 54-55 notes). It is also found in Hebrews, see above p. 350, yet it is one of the main themes of the NT, as may be seen from the survey by Hauck, p. 589 ff., and its *eschatological note* is most marked: the Christians have to wait for the end, the return of Christ, and during this time of waiting they are beset by many trials; therefore they must patiently endure. It has

always the accent of activity, it is "Ausdauer", not "Leitsamkeit". This is also the background in 1 Clem., as is seen from 35:4 "that we may be found in the *number of those who patiently await Him*", cf. the parallel expressions 2:4 the number of the elect; 58:2 the number of those who are saved; 59:2, which is an eschatological term.

e. Something must be said about the next two chapters, because they belong close together and throw some more light on the preceding words[77]. The beginning of ch. 35 gives an *explanation of what is meant by "what He has prepared for those who await Him"*. The author does so by pointing out to his readers the marvellous gifts which God has given them already and which are fully known to them, because they have all fallen within the reach of their mind (for διάνοια see 21:8, 23:1 and J. Behm in Kittel IV, p. 961-965; it has a close affinity to the biblical use of 'heart'; it is not merely intellectual), their "geistiges Leben" (Behm), vs. 1-2. But having this experience, what are then the "things that He has prepared"? Their quality and beauty are known only to God Himself, the Creator and Father of the ages, both this world and the coming one (and not: of the "aeons" = angels, so Knopf; for the word, see H. Sasse in Kittel I, p. 202-207), vs. 3. But they have been promised by Him who is faithful in His promises (28:1-2) for those who endure and await Him. Therefore, says vs. 4, we must fight to be found among those blessed people, "in order that we may receive a share in those gifts" (parallel to 34:7). All expressions have here an eschatological sense and the difference between the present and future promised gifts is quite clear (so rightly Lightfoot, Knopf; Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, vol. I, p. 208 also understands the difference, but misses the point in saying: "ein unablässiges Ringen um die verheissenen künftigen Gaben Gottes auf Grund der Gaben, die wir bereits in der Gegenwart besitzen, nämlich Leben in Unsterblichkeit usw.", this "auf Grund" being not in the text nor implied; Clement uses the argument "a minori ad maius"). The Christians are still on the way (35:5) to this end. For these reasons the interpretation of Probst, which was consequent in trying to find the eucharist in this whole passage (34:5 ff.), but which could only be reached by a phantastic exegesis (the promised gifts = Christ Whom the believers receive in the eucharist, see above p. 327 f.), is absolutely wrong and has been silently dropped by his followers.

In 35:5-11 the writer shows the way in which this end will be reached: positively by a mind that is fixed through faith upon God and by following in the way of truth, negatively by rejecting all sorts of vices (Rom. 1:29-32) and consentment with evildoers (Ps. 50:16-23), ending with θυσία αἰνέσεως δοξάσει με, καὶ ἐκεῖ ὁδός, ᾗ[78] δείξω αὐτῷ τὸ σωτήριον τοῦ θεοῦ.

θυσία αἰνέσεως: in 52:3 a similar expression from Ps. 50:14 is explained by "a broken spirit" (Ps. 51:17); the author is also thinking of Heb. 13:15-17, where this offering is defined as: to confess God's name, to do good and communicate ("for with such sacrifices God is well pleased", εὐάρεστεω 1 Clem. 35:5; followed by obedience to the leaders, a favorite theme of Clement).—ὁδός looks like a refrain, cf. vs. 5 middle: "and there is a way in which I shall show him the salvation of God". That is the way in which they have found Jesus Christ, their salvation, because he gave them the gifts of 35:1, who is now in heaven (the wording recalling the epistle to the Hebrews) their Helper (cf. ad 34:7), to whom will be subjected His adversaries, which are those who are wicked and resist His will. This last explanatory clause rounds off the argument of the preceding chapters which deal with doing good, i.e. in this case being obedient, while it implies that they who follow this way will see the complete revelation of God's salvation at the end.

Here the long description of the Christian existence in the period between the coming of Christ and the final revelation of God's Kingdom, between—to put it in a more personal way—conversion and final judgment, in which they are called to doing well according to the will of God, finds its conclusion[79]. The next chapters give the application of this principle, which has already been mentioned in the course of the exposition, to the present situation of the church in Corinth.

Conclusion

1. The right understanding of the disputed passage required a meticulous exegesis which has not been given by any previous expositor, though the importance of the subject with regard to the history of the liturgy made it well worth while. Lest the reader runs the risk of not seeing the wood for the trees, it seems advisable to give a summary of our findings in a translation with some additional matter, which brings out the overtones of Clement's words.

Translation: (3) The judgment of the Lord is at hand in which He shall give the reward to everyone according to his works, says the Scripture. (4) Therefore, He urges us, who believe with our whole heart in Him, not to be idle or careless unto every good work. (5) Our glory and confidence must be in Him (and not in other men nor in ourselves). Let us subject ourselves to His will; let us consider how the whole multitude of His angels (consisting of millions) minister unto His will, standing before Him (or: by Him). (6) For the Scripture says: "Ten thousand times ten thousand stood before Him and thousand times thousand ministered unto Him, and they shouted: 'Holy, holy, holy (is) the Lord Sabaooth,

full is the whole creation of His glory' ''. (7) Therefore (noticing this unity in multitude), we too in concord brought together to one place by compliance to the Lord's will (and not by fear for the judgment), let us as from one mouth cry (for help in our dangerous situation) unto Him with fervour in order that we may become (after the judgment) sharers in His great and glorious promises. (8) For (the Scripture, or: He) says: ''Eye saw not and ear heard not, and it entered not into the heart of man, whatsoever things God prepared for them that (patiently) await Him''.

2. The whole passage is *enclosed by the eschatology* (vs. 3 and 8), its terminology is strongly eschatological (vs. 5-6) and its wider context (ch. 28-36) is also marked by an eschatological background. Even though Clement does not give fanciful descriptions of the coming judgment and glory like those of the apocalyptics, he is firmly convinced of the coming end. He is dealing with a pre-judgment crisis in the Christian church and this situation is measured by the rule of acting according to the Will of God, which will also be the standard when at the final judgment the reward will be given according to men's actions. Acting according to the will of God = doing good works.

In this passage the following ideas are found:

a) subjection to the will of God, as may be seen from the angels who being so many in number sanctify the Lord's name *univoce*, as is witnessed by the Scripture, and serve His will in that way;

b) the Christian church gathered in unity, because they know the will of God, must cry unto the Lord to be saved from the dangers of this world, among which are sedition and revolution as appearing in Corinth:

c) only in this way the glorious end which the Lord has promised and which transcends all human imagination will be reached.

Between vs. 6 and 7 there is a gap; vs. 6 gives the reason for and contents of the will of God in vs. 5; vs. 7 describes a meeting of the church which serves this will of God amongst the afflictions and dangers of this world, longing for the end. Therefore it is impossible to see a direct parallelism between the two. *Consequently this passage does not speak of the heavenly ''Sanctus'' which is imitated on earth.*

3. Once more we return to the ''liturgical interpretation''. On p. 342 above the expression ''superficial reading'' was used to indicate the origin of this conception. The *mistakes of the advocates of this theory* are the following:

a) they did not take into account the direct nor the wider context of the well-known verses; even if they printed the passage in full, they actually read it as though Clement's words were: ''let us look at the angels who sing the 'Sanctus' and let us at our eucharistic services sing likewise''; this picking out of certain words is not permissible. Generally only the

verses 5b-8 are quoted, but then the point of this passage is missed, because it is taken out of its proper setting. It is a warning example against working with "select passages".

b) former expositors and even more those who simply quoted the verses because they were so "self-evident" did not take into account the language of Clement; they often picked out a single word, e.g. ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτὸ συναχθέντες or some phrases which are also used in later liturgies, without asking whether this is typical liturgical language or whether it can be explained in another way which fits in with the whole train of thought. This kind of "exegesis" is impermissible. Therefore a careful weighing of every word was indispensible.

c) the eschatological background (p. 354 f. above) is absolutely overlooked.

d) in the "liturgical explanation" vs. 6b and 7a are closely connected, which is impossible according to the expressions of Clement (see p. 342). But even if this were true—quod non—, then it is left unexplained, how the "Sanctus" can be indicated by βοήσωμεν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἐκτενῶς εἰς τὸ μετόχους ἡμᾶς γενέσθαι τῶν μεγάλων καὶ ἐνδόξων ἐπαγγελιῶν αὐτοῦ.

I do not think that it is possible to give an explanation, except by the way of Probst (p. 327 f.) which is not explanation, but substitution of one's own words. Then of course it is easier to leave the words unexplained and to suggest that the words "evidently" mean the "Sanctus"; but that cannot be called permissible in scientific work. Moreover if one sees the function of the "Sanctus" in later liturgies, it will be clear that it is not the same as "crying unto the Lord" in its real sense. Probst again felt the difficulty here, but said that this name was a "pars pro toto". This is evidently a loop-hole and would be quite unique. Sometimes the mentioning of the "Sanctus" in this place which on the whole is left unexplained (see above *a*), is "explained" by referring to ch. 33: there the description of the creation is liturgical, being derived from the beginning of the eucharistic prayer[80], and since the eucharistic prayer ended with the "Sanctus" it is quite clear that the "Sanctus" is used in 34:6-7. This argument is absolutely worthless, because 1) this exegesis of ch. 33 is wrong, since it misses the point (the beauties of the creation are not mentioned in order to receive man's thanks, but because God himself rejoiced over His works, vs. 2 and 7; in accordance with the whole argument Clement is using the "tertium comparationis": doing good works is a joyful thing, as is clear from vs. 8)[81]; 2) no answer is given to the question, what we must do with the verses 34:1-5a and why the unity in the eucharistic prayer, supposing that it is the background, was broken.

4) *Our conclusion*: on p. 327 above we put the question whether the "Sanctus" was mentioned in 1 Clem. 34, as was maintained by the ma-

jority of scholars, or not, and we saw that the answer to this question had a far-reaching bearing upon the whole history of the liturgy of the ancient church. Our answer after a careful reading of the text in its proper context can only be: *there is no reason whatever to find the "Sanctus" here.* This may seem a fairly negative conclusion. In fact it is only so on the wrong supposition persistently repeated and copied that it was there. All reconstructions of the early liturgy based upon this fact, which is only a shadow of a hypothesis, have to be revised.

In summing up the results of the present investigation the writer would like to draw attention to three points:

a) a better and more satisfactory explanation of ch. 34 and its environment has been reached; in view of the great importance of the letter as a document of early Christianity and the key-position it holds in many questions, this is very valuable.

b) the eschatological background of this passage, its importance for the discussion of good works, and therefore for the epistle as a whole, has come to light. This involves that the explanation of these chapters by Knopf and the question of the moralism of Clement must be studied afresh. Most certainly it brings the relation of 1 Clement to New Testament Christianity in a new phase. Generally it is thought that this letter is an early witness of the rapid entrance of the process of ,,Enteschatologisierung" in the church, so e.g. Lodder[82]: "de eschatologische stemming is m.i. in zijn brief volkomen afwezig", and von Harnack[83]: "Für die schnell und stark in der Kirche einsetzende Depotenzierung der eschatologischen realistischen Hoffnungen ist der Brief besonders wichtig". The contrary is true, and given the great importance of eschatology for the whole Christian attitude of life and thought, the appreciation of Clement's theology will need revision.

c the text we studied, especially 34:7, does say something about the early Christian church-service, though not about the eucharist. It is often suggested to-day that the Christians at that time only (or mainly) came together to celebrate the eucharist. Here we see another characteristic that seems to have been of the greatest importance to the author, viz. a prayer-meeting in which they cry unto the Lord for the great salvation: an element which is too much overlooked, and which may be, but is not necessarily connected with the eucharist.

NOTES

* Appeared in: *Vigiliae Christianae* V (1951), p. 204-248.

[1] From codex H, published by Bryennios in 1883, afterwards from the versions, see K. Bihlmeyer, *Die apostolischen Väter* I, Tübingen 1924, p. xxviii.

[2] H. Lietzmann, *Geschichte der alten Kirche*, Berlin 1932, Vol. I, p. 209.

[3] J. Lebreton-J. Zeiller, 'l'Eglise primitive', in: A. Fliché-V. Martin, *Histoire de l'Eglise*, Paris 1946, vol. I, p. 360-361 and note 1.

[4] The same series in Bihlmeyer, op. cit., p. xii-xiii; sometimes ch. 44 is added, see also: J. Quasten, *Vetusta Documenta Liturgica*, Bonn 1937 and J. H. Srawley, *The Early History of the Liturgy*[2], Cambridge 1947, p. 25-27; A. Fortescue, *The Mass*[9], London 1950, p. 13.—For the expositors of 1 Clem., see p. 327 ff. above.

[5] W. D. Maxwell, *An Outline of Christian Worship*[4], Oxford 1949, p. 8-9. The Sanctus is the threefold "Holy", the angelic hymn of Isaiah 6:3 which forms the conclusion of the Preface in the Liturgy (cf. J. Braun, *Liturgisches Handlexicon*[2], Regensburg 1924, p. 355, s.v. 'Trishagion'); see below note 7.

[6] Quotations from the Greek text of 1 Clement are taken from the edition of Bihlmeyer, mentioned in note 1.—The English translation usually follows Lightfoot (see note 11), while the translation of biblical texts is according to the Revised Version.

[7] The "Sanctus" (note 5) is often called the "Trishagion", but since the latter name is also used for the much later hymn "Holy God, Holy Mighty, Holy Immortal, have mercy upon us", which is found in the East since the middle of the 5th cent. (see Braun, op. cit., p. 355), it seems preferable to prevent confusion by distinguishing the two by different names; therefore the present writer is always speaking of the "Sanctus", see also Lightfoot, I, p. 389 note.

[8] F. Probst, *Liturgie der ersten drei christlichen Jahrhunderte*, Tübingen 1870, p. 8.

[9] Probst does not quote the exact wording, but refers to the "Clementine Liturgy", see: F. E. Brightman, *Liturgies Eastern and Western*, Oxford 1896, vol. 1, p. 18 (abbreviated: *L.E.W.*).

[10] Probst, op. cit., p. 41-46.

[11] J. B. Lightfoot, *The Apostolic Fathers*[2], Part I *S. Clement of Rome*, London 1890, vol. 1, p. 386-392 (quoted as Lightfoot I or II; in the discussion of the following pages it is always the second volume with the exposition that is referred to).

[12] Cf. P. Drews, *Untersuchungen über die sogen. clementinische Liturgie im VIII. Buch der apostolischen Konstitutionen*, I *Die clementinische Liturgie in Rom*, Tübingen 1906, p. 7: "Aber diese Untersuchungen von Probst haben sich keine Anerkennung zu verschaffen gewusst. Weder Katholiken, noch Protestanten haben seine Ergebnisse ernst genommen oder auch nur einer genauen Nachprüfung unterzogen, geschweige darauf weitergebaut."

[13] Drews, op. cit., p. 21-22 and p. 161-164.

[14] R. Knopf, in: E. Hennecke, *Handbuch zu den neutestamentlichen Apokryphen*, Tübingen 1904 (short notes) and his important commentary in: H. Lietzmann, *Handbuch zum Neuen Testament, Ergänzungsband*, Tübingen 1920, p. 41-150 (this commentary is always meant, when the name of Knopf is used without further title).—The same may be seen in comparing A. Harnack's two commentaries, resp. in: *Patrum Apostolicorum Opera*, Leipzig 1876, vol. I and the short notes added to his *Einführung in die alten Kirchengeschichte*, Leipzig 1929.—Some other names (cf. also note 4) may be mentioned in this connexion without aiming at completeness of references: G. Rauschen, *l'Eucharistie et la pénitance durant les six premiers siècles de l'Eglise*[2], tr. M. Decker-F. Ricard, Paris 1910, p. 95, n. 2: "Drews remarque avec raison qu'il ne s'agit ici que d'une utilisation liturgique".—W. Bousset, *Jüdisch-christlicher Schulbetrieb in Alexandrien und Rom*, Göttingen 1915, p. 309-310.—G. P. Wetter, *Altchristliche Liturgien*, Göttingen 1919, vol. I, p. 20-21.—J. M. Hanssens, *Institutiones Liturgicae de ritibus orientalibus*, vol. III, Rome 1932, p. 398: "Praeter Clementis Romani *I ad Corinthios*, 34, 6 ..... quae duos locos: *Daniel* 7, 10, et *Isaias* 6, 3 iam in unam liturgicam formulam coniunctos exhibet, duo antiquissima documenta de usu hymni *Sanctus* in ecclesiis orientalibus sunt" Cyrillus Hier. et Serapion Thmui.—A. Fortescue, l.c., p. 13, 67: "Clement of Rome already refers to it".—These writers do not give new arguments; for that reason they are not mentioned in the text; they are quoted here as examples of the far-reaching influence of the thesis of Drews among all sorts of scholars.

[15] O. Bardenhewer, *Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freiburg i. Br. 1924, vol. IV, p. 262-275; B. Altaner, *Patrologie*[2], Freiburg i. Br. 1950, p. 43-44.

[16] See H. Lietzmann, *Messe und Herrenmahl*, Bonn 1926, p. 127-132.

[17] E. Schwartz in 1910 and R. H. Connolly in 1916; cf. the monograph by Dix, quoted in the next note.

[18] G. Dix, *The Apostolic Churchorder of St. Hippolytus*, London 1937.

[19] See Lietzmann, *Messe*, p. 6; Srawley, l.c. p. 86 ff.; Quasten, *Vet. Doc. Lit.*, p. 197: "postquam F. Probst ineunte altero saeculo ortam esse, P. Drews ... iterum demonstrare conatus est hanc liturgiam apostolorum aetatis esse. Sed nostris temporibus nemini fere haec sententia probatur, nam plurimi eorum, qui historiae liturgiae student, ritum missae VIII libri Constitutionum syram liturgiam exeuntis IV saeculi esse consentiunt."

[20] A. Baumstark, 'Trishagion und Qedusha', in: *Jahrbuch für Liturgiewissenschaft* III (1923), p. 18-32 (italics are mine); Baumstark's way of arguing in this article is fairly hypothetical.—His theory was criticized by J. M. Hanssens, l.c., III, p. 404 and E. Peterson, *Das Buch von den Engeln*, Leipzig 1935, p. 115 ff.

[21] W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, Oxford 1925, p. 42-47.

[22] Lietzmann, *Messe*, p. 167-168.

[23] Y. Brilioth, *Eucharistic Faith and Practice*, London 1930, p. 18-19, 24-25.

[24] Srawley, l.c., p. 26-27.

[25] F. Cabrol, *Les origines liturgiques*, Paris 1906, p. 329.

[26] As referred to by C. W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*, Oxford 1944, p. 108, n. 5.

[27] I. E. Rahmani, *Les liturgies orientales et occidentales, étudiées séparément et comparées entre elles*, Beyrouth 1929, p. 537.

[28] B. Botte, *Le Canon de la Messe romaine*, Louvain 1935: "le texte de Clément ne prouve nullement que le *Sanctus* était déjà chanté de son temps à la liturgie eucharistique" (I owe this reference to the kindness of Miss Mohrmann).

[29] Dugmore, l.c., p. 108.

[30] G. Dix, *The Shape of the Liturgy*[2], Westminster 1945, p. 165.

[31] Cf. J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum Solemnia*, Wien 1948, vol. II, p. 156-168, who after a careful weighing of the arguments concluded to a "non liquet".

[32] The slight doubt expressed by some authors in the word "probable" can be neglected, since it has not any practical effect upon their position.

[33] As was suggested to me by Miss Mohrmann in a private letter.

[34] A good number of passages was collected by J. Bingham, *Antiquities of the Christian Church*, xv 3, 10.

[35] Brightman, *L.E.W.*, p. 479.

[36] E. Dekkers, *Tertullianus en de geschiedenis der Liturgie*, Brussel-Amsterdam 1947, p. 43-44: "Ook het ‚Sanctus' komt in de hier behandelde bronnen tweemaal voor, en wel in een context, dat aan liturgische plechtigheden doet denken; toch zal men uit dergelijke teksten moeilijk iets zekers kunnen opmaken omtrent het gebruik van het Trishagion in de afrikaanse liturgie ten tijde van T." (p. 43).

[37] Drews, op. cit., p. 82.

[38] E. van der Schoot, *Hervormde Eredienst*, 's-Gravenhage 1951, p. 23.

[39] See Dugmore's book and: I. Elbogen, *Der jüdische Gottesdienst in seiner geschichtlichen Entwicklung*[3], Frankfurt a.M. 1931, p. 61 ff., 586-587.

[40] This has been brought forward in the preceding chapter 27:5-6, which demonstrates that God is just in His judgments (1); all things are heard and seen and accordingly judged.

[41] For the translation, see Lightfoot II, p. 286 ff.

[42] This expression in itself is not particularly "liturgical", as was suggested by Lightfoot, I, p. 387; for "to approach", see also 33:8 and "to lift up the hands" may be said of all prayers, cf. 2:3, and is the ordinary expression in antiquity for praying in general, see Bauer (note 53), col. 406 and 467.

[43] The terminology of the letter is quite consistent; Clement has always the situation in Corinth in his mind, see: Kwa Joe Liang, *Het begrip deemoed in 1 Clemens*, Utrecht 1951 (diss. Utrecht), p. 46-68.

[44] The full text reads as follows: "From him (Jacob) are all the priests and levites, who serve the altar of God; from Him the Lord Jesus according to the flesh; from Him kings, rulers and governors according to Judah; and the rest of his sceptres are not in small honour etc."; compare with it the tendentious paraphrase by Lightfoot, p. 387: "these (our ministrations) were rendered under the Old Covenant by the levitical hierarchy; they culminate under the New in Jesus Christ". Clement is speaking of the blessings given by God to Jacob, of which he enumerates three in particular which stand in the same line; nothing is said of any special connection of the first two; on the contrary Jesus is called "the Lord".—This is one and a very obvious example of Lightfoot's method in this paragraph (see p. 328 above); it would take too much space to point out all the cases in which Lightfoot handles the material in this way: "ex ungue leonem"!

[45] I cannot find here special Stoic phrases, cf. my article: 'Is 1 Clement 20 purely Stoic?', in: *Vigiliae Christianae* IV (1950), p. 181-189 [In this volume, p. 52 ff.]. The description is based upon the OT story with some literary embellishments (contra Knopf's exposition).

[46] I follow Bihlmeyers text, based upon all manuscripts; Lightfoot: "we have seen"; cf. the note of Bihlmeyer a.l.

[47] Changing here Lightfoot's translation in order to bring out more exactly the point of Clement's argument.

[48] Lightfoot, following MS. A, has not "good" here, but all other MSS. have it and it is "der springende Punkt".

[49] See Knopf, l.c.

[50] Other parallels may be found in Nestle's edition of the NT ad 2 Cor. 11:15 *in margine.*

[51] See E. J. Goodspeed, *Index Patristicus*, Leipzig 1907, s.v.

[52] F. Blass-A. Debrunner, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*[7], Göttingen 1943, Suppl. p. 74 (this work is quoted by author's names and number of the paragraph).

[53] W. Bauer, *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des N.T. und der übrigen urchristlichen Literatur*[3], Berlin 1937 (abbreviated: Bauer).

[54] G. Kittel, *Theologisches Wörterbuch zum N.T.*, Stuttgart 1933-..., vol. I-... (the work itself is quoted as "Kittel" with indication of the name of the author of the particular article).

[55] Kwa Joe Liang, l.c., ch. II-III.

[56] Cf. R. Bultmann, in: Kittel I, p. 190.

[57] See *Vig. Christ.* IV (1950), p. 184, n. 7. [p. 53 above]

[58] See the instances in Goodspeed's Index, s.v.

[59] W. Wrede, *Untersuchungen zum Ersten Klemensbriefe*, Göttingen 1891, p. 58 ff.

[60] Cf. also H. B. Swete, *Introduction to the O.T. in Greek*[2], Cambridge 1914, p. 408.

[61] See on this chapter my article quoted before (note 45).

[62] Kwa Joe Liang, l.c., p. 63-65.

[63] J. H. Moulton-G. Milligan, *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament illustrated from the papyri and other non-literary sources*, London 1930, p. 94 a, s.v.

[64] See Goodspeed's Index, s.v.

[65] For other explanations which cannot be discussed within the scope of this article, see the commentaries on Romans 13:1-5; here is only offered what seems the best explanation to the present author.

[66] In Germany the question was debated whether the "powers" were not heavenly powers, see literature in: Kittel V, p. 441, n. 401. I do not think that this can be true.

[67] See G. Stählin, in: Kittel V, p. 441-442.

[68] This comes in the line of: "pflichtgemäss" (Bauer), but is more theocentric.

[69] For various explanations see the commentaries ad locum.—Note 65 could be repeated here.

[70] H. Windisch, *Die katholischen Briefe*[2], Tübingen 1930, p. 64: "das Bewusstsein um Gott .... die innere Gebundenheit an Gott", but without the parallel with Rom. 13:5.

[71] I cannot enter here upon the question whether these three instances belong to a kind of catechetical instruction, as is again maintained by E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of Peter*, London 1946, p. 426 ff., without taking into account 1 Clement.

[72] Moulton-Milligan, p. 592a.

[73] See Harnack, *Einführung*, p. 66-71.

[74] As against E. Stauffer, p. 626, n. 17, who calls it "blass".

[75] In all instances, mentioned by Goodspeed, *Index*, s.v. λέγει, except those cited in the text.

[76] ὅσα = all those, Bauer, p. 976.

[77] These chapters are only discussed in sofar they have any bearing upon ch. 34 and not in detail, which would take us to quite other problems too.

[78] ἤ with Lightfoot, a.l., against Bihlmeyer, because of LXX and the sequence.

[79] Harnack, *Einführung*, p. 52, n. 1: "...die Hauptcäsur zwischen c. 36 und 37 fällt".

[80] Drews, op. cit., p. 14 ff.; Knopf in his explanation of the chapter; Lietzmann, *Messe*, p. 167.

[81] The explanation of these probable parallels cannot be tried here; I may suggest that there was either influence of 1 Clement upon the compiler of the *Const. Apost.*, who made use of various sources or merely the same "reaction" of these Hellenistic Christians to the story of Genesis.—This subject needs further investigation.

[82] W. Lodder, *De godsdienstige en zedelijke denkbeelden van* 1 *Clemens*, Leiden 1915 (Diss. Groningen), p. 178.

[83] Harnack, *Einführung*, p. 101.

DOMINUS VOBISCUM: THE BACKGROUND OF A LITURGICAL FORMULA*

The new service-book of the Dutch Reformed Church[1] gives in several of its formularies as an optional introduction to prayer the dialogue between minister and congregation:

"The Lord be with you."
R. "And with thy spirit."
"Let us pray."

To Roman Catholic, Anglican and Lutheran Christians it is a familiar part of the liturgy, because it belongs to the age-old heritage of Latin Christianity. As such it was taken over by the committee which prepared the revision of the Dutch Reformed Liturgy. But *what is the meaning of this dialogue both in its constituent elements and in its sequence*? It is not out of place to raise this question, because the church of our days is not helped by ancient formularies as such, but only by a living expression of its faith[2]. It is somewhat startling to read in this connection the following statement by a Jesuit who is one of the leading authorities in the liturgical field:

> In einem aus heutigem Empfinden geschaffenen Gottesdienst würden wir kaum auf den Gedanken kommen, dass der Vorbeter zuerst die Gemeinde begrüssen soll, noch weniger würden wir daran denken, ihn diesen Gruss im Verlauf der Gebetsstunde öfters wiederholen zu lassen[3].

I have consulted many books and various experts, but did not receive a satisfactory answer; it seemed as though this formula is so customary and revered that nobody asks for its proper meaning.

The first occurrence of the dialogue is—according to the present knowledge of sources—found in the Church Order of Hippolytus (*c.* 200): it goes before and is connected with the preface to the great eucharistic prayer[4]. In later stages of liturgical development it is used on several other occasions as an introduction to prayer and to the reading of the Gospel. It is remarkable that this particular form is restricted to the Western and Egyptian traditions; in the other Eastern liturgies the salutation has a different wording, viz.: "*Peace be with you*" or the formula of 2 Cor. 13:13[5]. Which is the older form, or are they rival developments? These and other interesting questions about the spread and use of this introductory greeting in the course of history cannot be investigated here, though much is still obscure[6]. For the present paper it is sufficient to establish the existence of the formula at about 200 AD;[7]

here attention will be focused on the origin and meaning of these short sentences.

The interpretation of the dialogue does not appear so simple as its wording. It is usual to refer to the Old Testament, generally to Judges 6:12 and Ruth 2:4[8]. To be sure there the greeting "the Lord with you"[9] occurs, but it should be observed that in the former it is not followed by an answer resembling that of the liturgy and in the latter the response of Boaz' reapers is: "The Lord bless you." What is the origin of "and with thy spirit"? Here one is suddenly sent to the New Testament, 2 Tim. 4:22: "the Lord with thy spirit", but this text is not a response; it is a special form of greeting. Nowhere is it explained how these texts, derived from such different surroundings, or others which are sometimes mentioned like Luke 1:28, Gal. 6:18, 2 Thess. 3:16 have become fused into this one dialogue. Influence of an unimportant book like Ruth is quite incredible. Frör finds the background of the priestly salutation in the liturgical practice of the apostolic church as mirrored in the Pauline letters, and says that the response of the people probably goes back to "die älteste urchristliche Zeit"[10]. This last statement is a mere guess apart from its vagueness, because the texts adduced (Gal. 6:18, Philem. 25, 2 Tim. 4:22) do mention the Spirit, but are not answers of the people; they stand, as seen from the formal side, on the same level as the texts he quotes for the greeting of the priest. Jungmann cites these texts as evidence for greetings in ordinary daily life. According to this author the priest calls for attention in prayer and listening to the Gospel; the form of a greeting is very appropriate, he says, because it calls for an echo and these two elements create an atmosphere "heiliger Gottesnähe, in der sich die Liturgie vollziehen soll"[11]. The answer is a Semitic expression for: "and also with you". Frör finds this too flat. The salution is an acclamation, of the same force as "Maranatha": "Die Gabe dieses jetzt unter uns gegenwärtigen Herrn, seine eschatologische Heilsgabe soll unter euch sein"; in combination with the response it means that in the presence of the risen Lord "sich jedesmal der Knoten der Liebe und Eintracht zwischen Pfarrer und Gemeinde aufs Neue schürzt"[12].

There is every reason to take up this question again, since these explanations do not appear to be satisfactory. Frör's interpretation suffers from a certain "pan-liturgism" which sees everywhere in the Pauline epistles the background of the liturgy whenever a simple parallel in wording between them and the *much later* liturgies is found[13]. But even if one takes the wider view about the "Sitz im Leben", viz. the ordinary daily salutation, one touches upon the difficulty—often met in form-criticism—that the form as such prevails over the contents. It seems to me far more important to ask what was expressed in this greeting than to

state that it is a greeting. Besides that it may be necessary to distinguish between a greeting at entering and at departing, since the two have not the same force[14]. The Pauline salutations stand at the end of his letters and the supposed connection with a (reconstructed) liturgy is without foundation in the texts.

It would be obvious to look for a solution to the Jewish liturgy which in so many ways offered the pattern for Christian worship. But search in that direction is in vain. Neither in the liturgy of the Temple nor in that of the synagogue is the slightest trace of such a dialogue to be found[15]. In daily life the greetings are always answered[16], but they were not given in the form 'the Lord with you'; it is always: "Peace on you"[17]. This was also the manner of Jesus' greeting according to John 20:19, 26 (Luke 24:36 varies in many manuscripts), cf. John 14:27 which is a possible reference to the practice of greeting. In Luke 10:5 He commands His apostles to use that form. It would be somewhat puzzling that the early Christian communities should have invented and had a form so different from that of the (risen) Lord[18]. There is no point of contact here.

The phrasing of the salutation raises a number of questions:

(A) Who is "the Lord": God the Father or Jesus Christ?[19]

(B) What mood of the verb "to be" should be supplied: "is" or 'be'?

(C) What is contained in this "to be with somebody", when said of the Lord?

(D) Why is this former part followed by "*and* with thy spirit", this second part of response being coupled to the former by καί and this continuation suggesting that there is a certain parallelism[20]. But how and why? Is this spirit the special grace of the priest given at his ordination[21]?

Let me first give some brief comments upon these questions. The first two are familiar in this connection. As to (A), it may be remarked that it is often difficult in Paul's letters to decide who is the κύριος[22]. Question (B), fact or wish, has often been discussed in connection with the final blessing of the congregation.

As to (D), the phrase is called a Semitism[23], practically amounting to "with yourself". This is stated without further notice, but in view of the linguistic evidence this interpretation is highly improbable, not to say impossible. If *psyche* (*nēpheš*) had been used, it would have been correct, since this often expresses "self" or "person" in Semitic texts, but I do not know a single unambiguous text where *pneuma* (*rûaḥ*) has this meaning[24]. So we must look for another explanation.

The crucial question is (C). It is somewhat surprising that always the same small group of texts is quoted, but the full evidence is not surveyed. The expression is found in numerous places of the OT and NT. What is even more surprising, the commentators on the Bible are so sure that

every reader knows exactly what is meant that they have practically no comments to make[25]. But is it really so crystal-clear? Let us specify this question somewhat more precisely.

(*a*) It goes without saying that the Bible and the Christian Church firmly believed in God's transcendence. God is in heaven and Jesus who was once on earth is now at the right hand of the Father in heaven (Eph. 1:20). But what did Jesus promise to His disciples when he said: "And lo, *I am with you* alway, even unto the end of the world" (Matt. 28:20)? This *concluding* verse comes after the declaration that Jesus has received all power (v. 18) and commissioned His disciples (v. 19). It is introduced with that "and lo" which is always in the Bible the indication of something extra-ordinary and unexpected. It must be something far more than Christ's "perpetual presence"[26] which makes the mission possible. Nor can we agree with Dodd who says: "The church is clearly conceived as the *locus* of the presence of Christ during the interval between His resurrection and παρουσία"[27]. It is fairly common, I know, to speak in this way about the church and Christ's presence. But is it not, I dare to ask, *loose* thinking? Are we to credit the early Christians who so clearly knew about Jesus' separation from the *earth* and His glorification in *heaven*, with such a conflicting view? On the other hand, Jesus does not speak to the church (a word Matthew knows), but to the apostles as missionaries. The use of the word "locus" suggests a static presence while, as will appear from the following pages, Jesus' "being with them" has quite different associations. This was seen by O. Michel who based himself on some OT texts and explained the expression as "protection"[28]. Since he, however, did not cover all the evidence, this explanation is insufficient.

(*b*) The Lord's "being with a person" cannot be interpreted from the point of view that the liturgy is "heaven on earth", a favourite idea in Orthodox theology. Such an interpretation conflicts with the sequence in Hippolytus: "sursum corda", etc., and cannot explain its introduction before prayer and Gospel-reading.

(*c*) In some places the salutation reads as follows: "the peace" or "the grace of the Lord with you" (or something similar). That is perfectly clear: a *gift* of the glorified Lord which can be received on earth. But it is not the same as "the Lord (Himself) with you", because there the Lord is thought to "be with somebody" on earth and at the same time in heaven. It is well-known that later Jewish thought introduced all sorts of intermediaries, such as the Name, the *Shekhina*, etc., to safeguard His transcendence and His nearness[29]. God's power is expressed by "the hand of the Lord was with ..."[30]. Elsewhere the "angel of the Lord" is a substitute for God Himself, a tendency already to be detected in the

OT[31]; if it is said that he is with somebody[32], there is no difficulty at all. But in the "Dominus vobiscum" we do not find such a substitute. Does this "to be with ..." express the same ontological presence as in the expression: "the angel is with ..." or "the peace is with ...", and how can it be reconciled with God's transcendence or Christ's ascension? It will be clear that this difficulty cannot be overcome by philosophical categories or scholastic reasonings, since this kind of thinking stands far apart from the biblical way of thought.

(*d*) There are some texts in the NT which call for special attention, because there God's "being with a person" is employed in a rather curious way and resists any interpretation we have met so far:

(1) In Acts 10:38, the speech of Peter in the house of Cornelius—perhaps a reflection of the ancient *kerygma*[33]—describes Jesus' appearance in these words: "How that God anointed him with the Holy Ghost and with power: who went about doing good and healing all that were oppressed of the devil, for *God was with him*". Here it is meant to explain why Jesus could develop this extra-ordinary activity. It does not say that God was *in* Him, but *with* Him; it is also more positive than "protection". The man Jesus of Nazareth is enabled to do these mighty works because of God's assistance. The second interesting feature is the reference to Jesus' being anointed with the Spirit. This suggests a connection between the Holy Ghost and the "God with him". Is this accidental? Or is there a close relation between the Holy Spirit and this "God was with Him"?

(2) In the brief summary of Joseph's life given by Stephen the phrase recurs as a quotation from the OT. Therefore we shall return to it later (p. 374), but at the present moment it is well worth noticing that in the NT story this expression is far more prominent than in the OT. There it is found four times in connection with the unhappy fortunes of his life, but in the NT it is, one may say, the leading motive of his whole life which is described here in one sentence while in the OT it fills several chapters: "and the patriarchs, moved with jealousy against Joseph, sold him into Egypt: and *God was with him* and delivered him out of all his afflictions and gave him wisdom and favour before Pharaoh, king of Egypt: and he made him governor over Egypt and all his house" (Acts 7:9 f.). Joseph is treated most inhumanly by his brethren, but not forsaken by God. The term does not describe only God's presence or protection, but the divine assistance which delivers him from evil (negative aspect) and makes him successful (positive aspect)[34].

(3) When Nicodemus comes to Jesus, he says according to John 3:2: "Rabbi, we know that thou art a teacher come from God (ἀπὸ θεοῦ ἐλήλυθας) for no man can do these signs that thou doest except *God be* (=

ἤ, subj. depending on ἐὰν μή) *with him.*'' Here the paradoxical situation which the term provokes at first sight (cf. p. 365) is clearly formulated: ''come from God'' (ἀπό = away!), and at the same time: ''God with him.'' These signs (wonders) make manifest the unique character of Jesus' ministry. The moving power behind it which makes these deeds of Jesus such conspicuous signs, different from the miracles of others, is this: ''God with him.'' This has been discovered by Nicodemus in that teacher Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph (1:45). Again it puts into words a positive force and not God's omnipresence. In this category the Jewish rabbi could conceive and explain the remarkable deeds of Jesus. This verse presupposes acquaintance with more ''signs'' than have been told in John so far. It also shows the existence of a general rule that could be applied to the special case of Jesus. Billerbeck does not offer any parallel. In the OT there is, however, a text connecting both elements, viz. 1 Sam. 10:7: ''and let it be, when these *signs* are come unto thee that thou do as occasion serve thee: for *God is with thee*'', the sign being Saul's prophetic enthusiasm[35], which came so unexpectedly (v. 11). Here it is related with the Spirit of God (v. 6). Is this also the case in John 3:2 as in Acts 10:38? I think it is, because in John Jesus is the bearer of the Spirit in a very special sense, cf. 1:32: ''John bare witness, saying, I have beheld the Spirit descending as a dove out of heaven; and it abode upon him''; and the Spirit is typically bound to Jesus during His lifetime on earth (7:39, 16:7).

On closer inspection it can be seen that these applications of the phrase are not so peculiar, but are in full agreement with the usage in the OT. Let us see what light is shed by the OT on our questions.

Very frequently it is said in the OT that God (or the Lord) ''is with a person''[36]. From this abundant material[37] it becomes perfectly clear that this expression *does not define a static presence, but a dynamic power*, as is in harmony with the active character of OT revelation[38]. As a short-hand note it indicates *one reality*, but on analysing this unit one discovers *various aspects* in this expression of God's dealing with man. They can be distinguished in the following manner:

(*a*) protection, help, deliverance;
(*b*) taking sides with;
(*c*) blessing and success, generally very concrete in worldly affairs;
(*d*) assurance that there is no reason to fear;
(*e*) exhortation to valour;
(*f*) sometimes conditioned by man's obedience.

It is double-sided in two respects: (1) it is positive and negative;

(2) it has an effect upon the person's *psyche* and on his outward circumstances.

It would take too much space to discuss all the OT texts. Some characteristic illustrations for every aspect will suffice. This analytical distribution should not be taken too rigorously, since the phrase is a unit, several aspects may be found together in the same text.

(*a*) Gen. 28:15: "And behold, *I am with thee* and will keep thee whithersoever thou goest" (to Jacob at Bethel).

Exod. 3:11 f., the call of Moses: "And Moses said unto God, Who am I, that I should go unto Pharaoh and that I should bring forth the children of Israel out of Egypt? And he said: Certainly *I will be with thee*".

Deut. 2:7: "For the Lord thy God has blessed thee in all the work of thy hand: he has known thy walking through this great wilderness: these forty years *the Lord thy God has been with thee*: thou hast lacked nothing."

Judges 2:18: "And when the Lord raised them up judges, then *the Lord was with the judge*, and saved them out of the hands of their enemies."

1 Sam. 17:37: "And David said: the Lord that delivered me out of the paw of the lion ... he will deliver me out of the hand of this Philistine. And Saul said unto David, Go and *the Lord shall be with thee.*"

1 Chron. 22:18: "*Is not the Lord our God with you* and has he not given you rest on every side? for he has delivered the inhabitants of the land into mine hands."

Judith 13:11 (when Judith returns to the city after the slaying of Holophernes): "Open, open now the gate: *God is with us*, even our God, to show his power yet in Israel, and his might against the enemy."

3 Macc. 6:13, 15: "Let the heathen to-day fear thy invincible might, thou glorious one who hast mighty works for the salvation of the race of Israel. ... Let it be shown to all heathen that *thou art with us*, O Lord, and hast not turned thy face away from us; but as thou hast said, Not even when they were in the land of their enemies have I forgotten them (Lev. 26:44), even so bring it to pass."

Ps. 90(91):15: "*I will be with him* in trouble; I will deliver him, and honour him."

Isa. 43:1-2: "Fear not, for I have redeemed thee.... When thou passest through the waters, *I will be with thee.*"

Jer. 15:20: "I will make thee unto this people a fenced brazen wall, and they shall fight against thee: but they shall not prevail against thee: for *I am with thee* to save thee and to deliver thee, saith the Lord."

See also Gen. 28:20, 35:3 (with addition of LXX "and he saved me"); Num. 23:21; Deut. 1:42, 32:12; Joshua 1:5; 1 Sam. 3:19; 20:13; 1 Kings 8:57; 2 Chron. 25:7; Esther 6:13; Judith 5:17; Hag. 1:13; Isa. 8:8, 10 (where the name "Immanuel" has been translated in LXX, while in 7:15 LXX has transliterated it), 43:5; Jer. 1:8, 19, 49:11 (MT 42:11).

(*b*) Num. 14:42: "Go not up, for *the Lord is not with you*"; 2 Chron. 13:12: "Behold, *God is with us* at our head"; 2 Chron. 32:8: "with him (Sennacherib) is an arm of flesh, but *with us is the Lord, our God*, to help us and to fight our battles"; Zech. 10:5: "they shall be as mighty men, treading down their enemies in the mire of the streets in the battle; and they shall fight, because *the Lord is with them*; and the riders on horses shall be confounded."

Jer. 20:11: "But *the Lord is with me* as a mighty man (μαχητής) and a terrible; therefore my persecutors shall stumble and they shall not prevail."

See also Deut. 1:42; Judges 1:19, 6:16; 2 Chron. 36:23; Isa. 43:5.

(*c*) Gen. 21:20: "*God was with the lad* (Ishmael) and he grew."

Gen. 26:3: "God said: *I will be with thee*, and will bless thee."

Gen. 39:23: "The keeper of the prison looked not to any thing that was under his hand (Joseph), because *the Lord was with him*; and that which he did, the Lord made it prosper."

Joshua 3:7: "The Lord said to Joshua, This day will I begin to magnify thee in the sight of all Israel, that they may know that, as *I was with Moses*, so *I will be with thee.*"

Judges 6:12 f.: "The angel of the Lord appeared unto him (Gideon) and said unto him, *The Lord is with thee*, thou mighty man of valour. And Gideon said unto him, Oh, my Lord, if *the Lord be with us*, why then is all this befallen us? and where be all his wondrous works which our fathers told us of ..."; v. 16: "Surely, *I will be with thee*, and thou shalt smite the Midianites as one man."

Ruth 2:4: "Boaz said unto the reapers, *The Lord be with you.* And they answered him, The Lord bless thee."

1 Sam. 16:18: "Behold, I have seen a son of Jesse ... that is cunning in playing, and a mighty man of valour, and a man of war, and prudent in speech, and a comely person, and *the Lord is with him.*"

2 Kings 18:7: "*The Lord was with him* (Hezekiah): whithersoever he went forth he prospered."

2 Chron. 1:1: "And Solomon, the son of David was strengthened in his kingdom, and *the Lord his God was with him* and magnified him exceedingly."

2 Chron. 20:17: "Ye shall not need to fight in this battle: set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem: fear not, nor be dismayed: to-morrow go out against them: for *the Lord is with you.*"

2 Chron. 35:21 = 1 Ezra 1:25 a word of Pharaoh Neco (*sic!*): "What have I to do with thee, thou king of Judah? I come not against thee this day, but against the house wherewith I have war; and God has commanded me to make haste: forbear thee from meddling with *God who is with me*, that he destroy thee not."

See also Gen. 21:22, 26:28, 31:5, 39:2-3; Joshua 1:9, 7:12, 14:12; 1 Sam. 10:7, 18:14, 28; 2 Sam. 5:10, 7:9, 14:17; 1 Kings 1:37 (cf. 3:6), 11:38; 1 Chron. 11:9, 17:2, 8, 22:11, 16; 2 Chron. 13:12; Judith 5:17, 13:11; Isa. 58:11 LXX.

(*d*) Deut. 20:1: "When thou goest forth to battle against thine enemies, and seest horses and chariots, and a people more than thou, thou shalt not be afraid of them: for *the Lord thy God is with thee*; which brought thee up out of the land of Egypt."

1 Chron. 28:20: "David said to Solomon his son, Be strong and of good courage, and do it; fear not, nor be dismayed: for *the Lord is with thee*; he will not fail thee nor forsake thee, until all the work for the service of the house of the Lord be finished."

Ps. 22(23):4: "I will fear no evil, for *thou art with me.*"

Jer. 1:8 (calling of Jeremiah): "Be not afraid because of them, for *I am with thee.*"

See also 2 Chron. 19:11, 20:17; Ps. 45(46):8, 12; Jer. 1:7 LXX, 26(46):28, 49:11; Isa. 43:1 f.

(*e*) Deut. 31:23: "He gave Joshua, the son of Nun, a charge, and said, Be strong and of a good courage; for thou shalt bring the children of Israel into the land which I sware unto them: and *I will be with thee.*"

Hag. 2:4 f.: "Yet now be strong, O Zerubbabel, saith the Lord; and be strong, O Joshua, son of Jehozadak, ... be strong, all ye people of the land, saith the Lort, and work, for *I am with you,* saith the Lord of hosts; according to the word that I covenanted with you, when ye came out of Egypt, and my spirit abode among you; fear ye not."

(*f*) 1 Kings 11:38: "And it shall be, if thou wilt hearken unto all that I command thee, and wilt walk in my ways, and do that which is right in mine eyes, to keep my statutes and my commandments, as David my servant did, that *I will be with thee* and will build thee a sure house, as I built for David."

2 Chron. 15:2: "Hear ye me, Asa, and all Judah and Benjamin: *the Lord is with you,* while ye be with him; and if ye seek him he will be found of you; but if ye forsake him, he will forsake you."

2 Chron. 19:11: Jehoshaphat in appointing judges who must do their work in complete accordance with God's law: "Deal courageously and *the Lord shall be with the good (man).*"

Amos 5:14: "Seek good, and not evil, that ye may live: and *so the Lord, the God of hosts, shall be with you,* as ye say."

See also 2 Chron. 17:3, 25:7.

It is interesting to see how this term was interpreted in later times. In the paraphrase of the Targum Onkelos, e.g., the element of "help" comes to the fore. Instead of "the Lord is with you" it has: "the Memra of the Lord is to your help" (*bs'dkh*[39]). In the Midrash Rabba Gen. 28:15 is explained as a word of assurance and protection[40] and an annotation on Exod. 3:12 says: "an expression used only to one who is afraid"[41]. Gen. 39:3 is explained in this way: his master suspected Joseph of witchcraft "until he saw the *Shekinah* standing on him"[42].

In Philo and Josephus, representing Hellenistic Judaism, the paraphrases of some relevant texts show that they do not retain the original wording—which was probably unintelligible to their readers—but bring out the element of divine assistance and the happiness it creates.

Philo, *de somniis,* I 30, § 179, on Gen. 20:15: μεγίστη δέ ἐστιν εὐεργεσία ψυχῇ πονούσῃ καὶ διαθλούσῃ συνοδοιπόρον ἔχειν τὸν ἐφθακότα πάντῃ θεόν.

Quod. det. pot. insid. soleat, 2, § 3, on Gen. 31:5: Laban is the world of senses; μετὰ σοῦ ὁ θεός means a soul in which God walks (ἐμπεριπατεῖ).

De post. Caini, 23, § 80, on Gen. 39:2: αὐτὸς ἄνδρα ἐπιτυγχάνοντα εἶπε τὸν Ἰωσήφ οὐκ ἐν ἅπασιν, ἀλλ' ἐν οἷς ὁ θεὸς τὸ εὐοδεῖν ἐχαρίζετο.

De fuga et inv., 25, § 140, on Exod. 3:12: ἡ θεοῦ μόνου σύνοδος.

De agricultura, 17, § 78, on Deut. 20:1: τοὺς ἔχοντας τὴν τοῦ μεγάλου βασιλέως θεοῦ δύναμιν ὑπερασπίζουσαν καὶ προαγωνιζομένην ἀεὶ καὶ πανταχοῦ· στρατὸς δὲ θεῖος αἱ ἀρεταὶ φιλοθέων ὑπέρμαχοι ψυχῶν.

De migrat. Abrah., 11, § 62-63, on Deut. 20:1, speaks of God as σύμμαχος ... τούτου γὰρ ἡ σύνοδος καθαιρεῖ πολέμους, εἰρήνην ἀνοικοδομεῖ, τὰ πολλὰ καὶ συνήθη κακὰ ἀνατρέπει, τὸ σπάνιον καὶ θεοφιλὲς γένος ἀνασῴζει.

Josephus, *Ant.*, I 19, 2, § 283 = Gen. 28:15, πρόνοια—II 12, 1, § 268 = Exod. 3:12, τοῦ θεοῦ συμπαρόντος—V 6, 2, § 213 = Judges 6:12, εὐδαίμονα καὶ φίλον τῷ θεῷ—VII 4, 4, § 91 = 2 Sam. 7:3, ὡς τοῦ θεοῦ πρὸς ἅπαντα αὐτῷ συνεργοῦ παρόντος—VII 14, 5, § 357 = 1 Kings 1:37, τὸν θεὸν Σολομῶνι εὐμενῆ γενέσθαι—IX 1, 2, § 11 = 2 Chron. 20:17, αὐτοῖς μάχεται τὸ θεῖον. These are not all his paraphrases; we merely choose some examples; the others show the same character. It is interesting to see that Josephus nearly always paraphrases the text of the OT and does not take over the OT phrase itself. This is the more striking, because in another passage of his own invention he uses the term himself. In its context and explanation it is very illuminating:

Ant., XV 5, 3, § 138, is part of a speech which king Herod delivers to encourage his troops in the warfare against the Arabs[43]. The Arabs have murdered some ambassadors of Herod, but the Jews are afraid to attack them. Then Herod is reported to have said: "Now perhaps somebody will say: 'What is right in the eyes of God and men is on our side, but they happen to be braver and more numerous.' It is, however, in the first place, unfitting for you to say so, because on the side of those with whom the right is, stands God; and where God is present, there are both numbers and bravery." (ἴσως τοίνυν ἐρεῖ τις, τὸ μὲν ὅσιον καὶ δίκαιον[44] μεθ' ἡμῶν, ἀνδρειότεροι καὶ πλείονες ἐκεῖνοι τετυχήκασιν. ἀλλὰ πρῶτον μὲν ἀνάξιον ὑμῖν ταῦτα λέγειν· μεθ' ὧν γὰρ τὸ δίκαιόν ἐστι, μετ' ἐκείνων ὁ θεός, θεοῦ δὲ παρόντος καὶ πλῆθος καὶ ἀνδρεία πάρεστιν.)

The parallel passage in BJ I 19, 3 ff., has nothing comparable[45].

This later Jewish exegetical material is important for the conception of the phrase in NT times. It also clearly points to the avoidance of the wording of the OT and gives the expression a more or less "neutral" turn. Presumably the difficulty formulated on p. 365 was felt already by these ancient authors. There is a marked difference here from the NT where the phrase is so freely used. At the later stage we shall see a wider implication of this difference and explain its great significance (see p. 382).

A survey of the material in the OT leads to some remarkable observations:

(1) The formula uses the words "God" and "the Lord" promiscuously and without distinction in meaning; sometimes both words are combined.

(2) The verb "to be" is sometimes used, sometimes left out (see below, no. 7). It is employed in all three tenses, depending on the situation. The Lord's active help was there in the past, is experienced in the present and will be there in the future. In past and present it can be seen. As to the future it is not always formulated as a wish (see below, no. 6), but mostly as a definite declaration.

(3) Frequent though the expression is, it occurs only twice in greetings, viz. Judges 6:12 and Ruth 2:4, the usual greeting-form being:

"peace"[46]. In the former case it is certainly something exceptional, because Gideon is not simply greeted, but called to be a judge and saviour (cf. p. 369). He cannot accept this (v. 15: "Behold, my family is the poorest in Manasseh, and I am the least in my father's house". He understands the full weight of the word of the angel, but he does not discover its truth. For the words "the Lord is with you" imply blessing in outward things, and the desolate situation of his country and the poor state of his family run counter to this existence of blessedness (cf. v. 13). The whole passage is clear evidence that this form of greeting was unique for a man like him in those circumstances.—As to Ruth 2:4 there is no such indication. It may be that this later book[47] wished to tell this story of the period of the Judges with colours derived from that book. It is also possible to interpret this word as a stimulus to the reapers for their work. Or is there an indication in the name of Boaz? According to a common explanation this name means: "In him is power"[48]. Can he pronounce that unusual greeting, because he has great power (of Yahweh) in himself?

(4) The Gideon-story is highly significant, because it shows that God's "being with a person" was not conceived as a permanent fact, but as a dynamic experience that acts in special cases which can be sharply discerned. The declaration of the angel (see below, no. 6) does not appear in his person and situation (v. 13). Then follows in v. 16: "The Lord said unto him, Surely *I will be with thee*, and thou shalt smite the Midianites." At that particular time in the future it will become evident (ἔσομαι, not εἰμί). Another patent example can be found in 1 Sam. 17:37. (see p. 368) and Judith 13:11. This dynamic conception, this not permanent, but suddenly appearing presence, when once observed, characterizes also the contents of other texts.

(5) The fact that "the Lord is with a person" can be discovered by others. It manifests itself outwardly, and even unbelievers see it.

> Gen. 21:22: "And it came to pass at that time that Abimelech and Phicol the captain of his host spake unto Abraham, saying, *God is with thee* in all that thou doest", cf. 26:28.
>
> Num. 23:21, words of Balaam: "*The Lord his God is with him* (Israel) and the shout of a king is among them."
>
> Joshua 22:31: "This day we know that *the Lord is with us*, because ye have not committed this trespass against the Lord."
>
> 2 Chron. 15:9: "And he gathered all Judah and Benjamin and them that sojourned with them out of Ephraim and Manasseh, and out of Simeon: for they fell to him out of Israel in abundance, when they saw that *the Lord his God was with him.*"
>
> Zech. 8:23: "Ten men shall take hold, out of all the languages of the nations, shall even take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you, for we have heard that *God is with you*" (this is more than a

movement among the pagans for monotheism; it is seeking protection and blessing from that God who blesses so manifestly His people).

See also Gen. 39:3; Joshua 3:7; 1 Sam. 3:19 f., 16:18, 18:28; 3 Macc. 6:15.

(6) In some places the term is given in the form of a wish. There it is interesting to look at the interpretative work of the LXX. In Exod. 10:10 and Joshua 1:17 it has ἔστω, in 1 Kings 1:37 εἴη, in 1 Kings 8:57 *γένοιτο* as an exact translation of the Hebrew, but we observe that in places like 1 Sam. 20:13; 1 Chron. 22:11, 16; 2 Chron. 19:11 the Hebrew iussive *yᵉhî* ("be") is rendered by the positive ἔσται. An odd example of this difference in translation may be seen in a text which is found three times in LXX: 2 Chron. 36:23 = 2 Ezra 1:3 = 1 Ezra 2:3; in the first two cases ἐσται, in the last ἔστω. It is important to see that this note of certainty about future help and blessing is far stronger than the subjective forms of wish and possibility. The expression is used with the future tense in Gen. 26:3, 31:13, 48:21; Exod. 3:12, 18:19; Deut. 31:23; Joshua 1:5, 3:7; Judges 6:16; 1 Sam. 17:37, 20:13; 2 Sam. 14:17; 1 Kings 11:38; Amos 5:14; Isa. 58:11. It is not only declared by God Himself, but also by men. The certainty existing already in the Hebrew text is underlined and strengthened in LXX. This is important for the rest of our discussion (this is a tendency opposite to that which can be observed with *'āmēn*—γένοιτο).

(7) It is also important to note the instances where the copula is missing in the Greek text (in literal translation of the Hebrew). That feature is not uncommon. In all these cases it is practically always a declaration, as appears from the context and therefore the later translators rightly add "was" or "is"[49].

In 1 Chron. 22:16 the end of the exhortation of David to Solomon is usually translated in an optative form: "arise and be doing, and *the Lord be with you*", but in view of v. 12 f. ("fear not, etc.", cf. p. 369) and v. 18 which is certainly declarative, it seems better to translate: "the Lord will be with you" (if Solomon follows the commandments of Moses; this "conditional" form is very marked in Chron., see p. 369). In Judges 6:12 the greeting is not a wish, but a declaration and so it is conceived by Gideon, as follows from his answer ("if the Lord is with us", as you say, why this miserable situation); this was also the understanding of Josephus (p. 371). The salutation in Ruth 2:4 is ambiguous; since the answer of the reapers is optative[50] one is inclined to translate the former part in the same way, but in view of Judges 6:12 it may be a declaration, when Boaz sees the work of the reapers.

(8) As will be seen from p. 388 n. 37, there is a curious distribution throughout the OT. It is fairly seldom found in Psalms and prophets,

where one would expect it, and rather frequent in the historical books with a marked preponderance in Gen., Joshua, Sam., and Chron. There is no connection with liturgical contexts. It is striking that this "being of God with ..." is not bound up with the Ark[51] or the Temple; in those cases the OT speaks about the "dwelling" of God and this difference once more brings to light the *active* character of the expression we are investigating, in contrast with the static conception, suggested to us by the verb 'to be'. Everywhere in the OT the phrase expresses the same dynamic reality (apart from one element which will be mentioned below, no. 10).

(9) If one makes a list of those "with whom God is", it is typical that the number of instances where the people of Israel as a whole, the chosen people of God is intended, forms a minority[52]. In the large majority of texts the term is used of *individuals*, and even where the people is meant it is sometimes individualized as in Deutero-Isa. and Jer. 26:28. The line does not go from the people as a whole to the individual, but rather the other way. It is not applied to every pious man in general, but to very *special persons*. It is a marked feature in the history of Jacob, Joseph (Moses), Joshua, the Judges (2:18 in general), Gideon, Saul and David (in 2 Chron. also of several other kings). Among the prophets it is precisely Jeremiah, the best known personality among the prophets, who yields some texts. It is often mentioned in connection with a special divine task, in which the particular man is assured of God's assistance, see e.g. Gen. 28:15; Exod. 3:12; Joshua 1:5; Judges 6:12 ff.; 1 Sam. 10:7; Jer. 1:8, 17, 19; the man himself is afraid to accept the task, because he has no strength in himself.

The OT itself shows that there exists some link between these individuals. It says that the Lord was with Joshua as He was with Moses (Deut. 31:23; Joshua 1:17, 3:7); something similar is said about Saul and David (1 Sam. 20:13) and David and Solomon (1 Kings 1:37). Is it possible to detect here a typical common factor?

(10) Here we come to a point that is of vital importance for the exact and full understanding of the expression. *Most of the individuals of whom it is declared that "God was with them" were specially endowed with the Spirit of God.* It is the Spirit with his manifold manifestations (cf. Isa. 11:2); the Spirit of wisdom and strength; the Spirit which makes men speak the words of God as a prophet and do His deeds.

Joseph: 4 times it is mentioned that "God was with him" (Gen. 39:2, 3, 21, 23) and in Gen. 41:38 after his interpreting of Pharaoh's dreams he is called "a man in whom the spirit of God is". It is interesting to see that these separate elements (the former is exclusively used for the prison-period; the latter for the explanation of the dreams and the reward of authority as

governor) are understood by the early Christians as a unity, as appears from Acts 7:9 f. (p. 366). The Spirit is not mentioned by Stephen, in all probability because it was implied in the words "God was with him".

Moses: Num. 11:17: "And I will take of the spirit which is upon thee"; in v. 25 that happens: "and it came to pass, that, when the spirit rested upon them (the elders), they prophesied". Cf. Deut. 34:10, Moses was a prophet.

Joshua: Deut. 34:9: "And Joshua, the son of Nun, was full of the spirit of wisdom; for Moses had laid his hands upon him."

Judges: cf. Judges 2:18; the Spirit is mentioned in the cases of Othniel (3:10), Jephthah (11:29), Samson (13:25, 14:6, 19, 15:14).

Gideon: Judges 6:34, when he enters upon his task: "the spirit of the Lord came upon Gideon" (ἐνέδυσεν, cod. B ἐνεδυνάμωσεν)[53].

Samuel: 1 Sam. 3:19 f.: "And Samuel grew, and the Lord was with him, and did let none of his words fall to the ground. And all Israel ... knew that Samuel was established to be a prophet of the Lord."

Saul: 1 Sam. 10:6 f.: "And the spirit of the Lord will come mightily upon thee, and thou shalt prophesy with them, and shalt be turned into another man. And let it be, when these signs are come unto thee, that thou do as occasion serve thee; for the Lord is with thee"; cf. also the story 19:20 ff.

David: 1 Sam. 16:13, after his anointing: "and the spirit of the Lord came mightily upon David from that day forward"; cf. the description of his person in v. 18, quoted p. 369. Important in this connection is the relation of Saul and David which is characterized by that spirit; 1 Sam. 16:14, after the anointing of David: "Now the spirit of the Lord had departed from Saul, and an evil spirit from the Lord (note the difference!) troubled him" (cf. vv. 15, 16, 23 and 18:10, 19:9). In 28:16 Samuel says: "The Lord is departed from thee and is with thy neighbour" (reading of LXX), because Saul had not obeyed God's command (v. 18).

Israel: 2 Ezra 19:20 (= Neh. 9:20): "Thou gavest also thy good spirit to instruct them and withheldest not thy manna from their mouth" (about the period in the wilderness); cf. also Isa. 63:10 ff.

Isa. 44:3: "I will pour my spirit upon thy seed and my blessing upon thine offspring", cf. 32:15, 59:21.

In other cases we have to do with the Patriarchs who have a special place in Jewish theology[54], and Jacob was credited with the spirit in later thought[55]; with anointed kings (if they are obedient) and with Jeremiah who was a prophet (1:5, 7).

Peculiar is the utterance about Pharaoh Neco, 2 Chron. 35:21, but see v. 22: Josiah "hearkened not unto the words of Neco, *from the mouth of God*", so it is prophetic.

Important also is the connection in Hag. 2:4 f., quoted on p. 370 and the same in 1:13 f. which show that the relation was still felt at that time.

The man to whom this "the Lord is with you" is said becomes a pneumatic; he is—as in the graphic description of Saul—"turned into another man". The man who is anxious becomes a hero; receives supernatural insight and is able to speak the word of the Lord. Through that quickening power of the Spirit unexpected results can come about.

This relation between "God's being with a person" and the Spirit is too frequent in the OT to be incidental or accidental. It may be left to OT scholarship to investigate whether this conception belonged to a certain period of religious development. For the NT scholar it is sufficient to know that this close connection is there, since the early Christians did not read the OT from the historical point of view, but saw it as a unit. In passing, however, it may be remarked that apparently there has been an important change of emphasis. It seems as though this bond between "God with a person" and the Spirit was loosened after the exile (see Chron.). It is not mentioned by the authors in the NT period (p. 371). If this is correct, it would not be surprising, since it was widely held among the Jews in NT times that there was no revelation of the Spirit in the present time, this being reserved for the eschatological future[56].

After this detailed discussion of the OT material the NT texts which employ the term need not detain us long. With the OT conception and its associations in mind we discover that in the NT the same reality is met with. Since that has generally been overlooked it will be our task to demonstrate that the term in the NT has still its vital force and that the living understanding of this expression throws into relief its full content.

In the texts quoted before (p. 366 f.) we observed a connection between Jesus' wondrous actions and the Holy Spirit which enabled Him to do them and which was recognized as such. This is not surprising, but in line with the OT conception. The promise to the disciples in Matt. 28:20 gets its full force in this perspective: after having set that enormous task (v. 19), Jesus who has now all authority comforts His weak followers (cf. 26:56) and assures them of His powerful assistance (note: εἰμί, not ἔσομαι) which will make their activity both possible and successful. That is the surprising declaration at the moment of departure. Matthew returns at the end to the beginning: Jesus was (1:23) and is "Immanuel" (see below), not only as the suffering Servant, but also as the triumphant king[57].

Here follow the other texts containing the expression in the NT.

(1) Matt. 1:23, a quotation from Isa. 7:14. The insertion of this quotation is an addition of the evangelist, i.e. it expresses his own conception and the message he wished to convey. It is also important to see that *he* offers the translation of the name which was left untranslated in LXX (see p. 368). This proves that he attached great value to the proper understanding of the name. This prooftext serves as the divine confirmation of what happened to Mary; her awkward position from the human point of view was according to the divine plan. Matthew not only quotes from Isaiah the first part about the virginity[58], but also the second part with the name (which was not the usual name for Jesus![59]), and wants his

readers to understand it: "God with us". Both parts of the citation run parallel with the preceding story: v. 18, "when his mother Mary had been betrothed to Joseph, *before they came together* she was found with child *of the Holy Ghost*" ... v. 20 (message of the angel to Joseph), "*fear not* to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is *of the Holy Ghost*". Because the unusual conception is the work of the Holy Spirit (mentioned twice), Jesus was "God with us". Against the OT background we discover what this means: it is the power of God who comes into action to deliver, to grant His blessing, to call for a new obedience to His will. The fact that Matthew could use this expression and brought it to the fore, without elucidation, shows that the ideas associated with the term were living conceptions for the Christians of the apostolic age.

> Jesus' healing work in silence, described in Matt. 12, is seen as a fulfilment of Isa. 42:1 ff.: "Behold, my Servant whom I have chosen, My beloved in whom my soul is well pleased, *I will put my Spirit upon Him*", cf. 3:16 f., Jesus' baptism with the Spirit.—In 12:28 Jesus asks: "But if I by the Spirit of God cast out devils, then is the kingdom of God come upon you", pointing at the Agent who works through Him.—This conception is closely akin to that of Acts 10:38.
>
> Matt. 18:20 may also be quoted in this connection: "For where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them". This ἐν μέσῳ stands parallel to μετά which is sometimes in LXX a translation of "in the midst", p. 388 n. 36. In Matt. this verse is the motivation ("for") of the preceding one; it explains why that prayer will be answered. In itself v. 19 is not self-evident. Where the smallest number of Christians are gathered in Jesus' name, they may be sure of *His* active assistance which is a spiritual power, bringing unity of spirit ("agree", v. 19) and contact with the Father.—The rabbinic parallel *Aboth* III 2, which is often quoted, shows as much difference of content as similarity!

(2) Luke 1:28, the angel saluting Mary: χαῖρε, κεχαριτωμένη, ὁ κύριος μετὰ σοῦ. The sequence of this saying is very illuminating. Mary is troubled by that "manner (!) of salutation", in all likelihood because it was unusual[60]. Then the angel gives an explanation: "*Fear not*, Mary: for thou has found favour with God" (this χάρις explains the κεχαριτωμένη); her child will be the wonderful fulfilment of the promises given to David. When Mary asks how that will come to pass to her, the virgin, the angel continues: "The *Holy Ghost* shall come upon thee and the power of the Most High shall overshadow thee; wherefore also that which is to be born shall be called holy, the Son of God" (v. 35). The fact that her kinswoman Elisabeth, the barren, is pregnant, is a sign[61] that "no word from God shall be void of power" (v. 37). Typical in this passage is that "fear not" which is often connected with "the Lord with thee" (p. 369).

The "word from God" which is not void, is here the greeting and assurance "the Lord with thee", and its content is defined by the great blessings (v. 32 f.), wrought by the Holy Ghost. This extensive passage again shows the heavy dynamic weight attached to these words and the sympathetic understanding of the NT writers. This simple maiden of Nazareth could not rank with the great men of Sacred History "with whom the Lord was", but God's election brings her there. This is the story of Mary's calling (cf. p. 374, that of Gideon especially may be compared, cf. v. 48). She is afraid and does not know how it shall be, just like men in the OT, but she accepts the task: "be it unto me according to thy word" (v. 38). The saying 'The Lord with thee' takes away fear and gives strength; its effect is blessing for Mary, the people, the world.

> For the special relation between Jesus and the Spirit, see His baptism, Luke 3:22, and His first public appearance, 4:1 (twice), 14 and particularly v. 18, a quotation of Isa. 61:1: "The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because He anointed me", etc., with the declaration in v. 21: "To-day hath this Scripture been fulfilled in your ears." This is fundamental for the whole of Jesus' activity in Luke.

(3) John 8:29: "He that sent me *is with me*; he has not left me alone, for I do always the things that are pleasing to him." Jesus speaks what the Father has taught him (v. 28; he is the Prophet, cf., e.g., 4:44, 7:40, 52). The association of ideas is familiar from the OT. He is not forsaken by the Father, as was Saul (1 Sam. 18:28; cf. 1 Chron. 28:20 (p. 369)). For ἀρεστά, a well-known word in LXX for obedience to God's will[62], see texts on p. 370, under *f.*

(4) John 14:16 contains the phrase, but the whole context is relevant: v. 12, "Verily, verily, I say unto you, he that believeth on me, the *works* that I do shall he do also; and greater works than these shall he do, because I go unto the Father.... (v. 15). If ye love me, ye will *keep my commandments* (v. 16). And I will pray the Father, and he shall give you another Comforter[63], that he may *be with you for ever* (v. 17), even *the Spirit* of truth ... ye know him, for he abideth with you and shall be in you (v. 18). I *will not leave you desolate*" (cf. also 16:13 f.). The Holy Spirit takes Jesus' place, but is there for ever, not on certain occasions (p. 372). It is the prophetic Spirit, as is seen from the teaching in these chapters 14-16. The conditions for and the effect of that abiding of the Spirit are the same as those connected with "The Lord with you" in the OT.

(5) John 16:32: "Behold, the hour cometh, yea, is come that ye shall be scattered ... and shall leave me alone; and *I am not alone, because the Father is with me.*" See above on 8:29. Jesus, left by His followers, is sure of God's protection (cf. the remarkable transposition of the word about

the cup in 18:11 as compared with that of the Synoptics, Mark 14:35 ff., and its parallels).

(6) Acts 18:9 f., in a critical situation of Paul's life at Corinth: "And the Lord said unto Paul in the night by a vision: *Be not afraid, but speak* and hold not thy peace: for *I am with you*, and no man shall set on thee to harm thee: for I have much people in this city." Paul must continue his divine, prophetic mission. The expression implies both protection, comfort and success; mark the combination with "fear not" (p. 369). Is this modelled after the experience of Jeremiah (cf. Acts 26:17; Gal. 1:15)? It is superfluous to give many texts for Paul's activity as a pneumatic, see, e.g., Acts 9:17, 16:6 f.[64]

(7) Four Pauline texts may be taken together:

Rom. 15:33: "*The God of peace with you all.*"

2 Cor. 13:11: "Finally, brethren, rejoice[65], be perfected, be comforted, be of the same mind, live in peace; and *the God of love and peace shall be* (ἔσται) *with you.*"

Phil. 4:9: "The things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do; and *the God of peace shall be* (ἔσται) *with you.*"

2 Thess. 3:16: "Now the Lord of peace himself give you peace at all times in all ways. *The Lord with you all.*"

These four texts are all at the end of the respective epistles but they do not give the final greeting[66], as is most clearly seen from Phil. 4:9. Besides the phrase "the Lord with you" they have also in common the combination with "the God of peace". This is a favourite expression of Paul: the God he preaches is "the God of peace". This does not envisage an inward peace of mind[67], as appears from 1 Cor. 14:33: "God is not a God of disorder, but of peace." In Rom. 16:20 and 1 Thess. 5:23 Paul describes what the "God of peace" accomplishes: the future subjection of Satan and the complete preservation of the Christian[68]. These last verses illustrate the texts we are studying. The peace is connected with the very concrete situation of the people addressed. Through strife and disunity the "peace" of the church is broken, as is patent from the epistles to the Corinthians, Philippians (strong appeal for unity!) and Thessalonians. If the readers fulfil the commandments of the apostle, he assures them of God's assistance and protection (2 Cor. 13:11; Phil. 4:9); this is in agreement with the OT conception (p. 368 f.). It is not purely eschatological (Phil. 4:9), but this "welfare" can be realized among them now, "the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace" (Eph. 4:3). It has a declarative force. That he could use it in Rom. 15:33 and 2 Thess. 3:16 without further explanation shows that this phrase was understood by his readers; that there is no copula there is not surprising, see p. 373, and does not

diminish its character of declaration. The Spirit has been given to the Christian community (Rom. 8:14 ff.; 1 Cor. 2:12 ff., 12:13).

Later rabbis saw in the phrase a word of assurance (p. 370) which would have been impossible if it were just a wish. The proper understanding of Matt. 1:23 and Luke 1:28 also brings to light the existing and active assistance of God's Spirit which is not wished or hoped for, but is present[69]. The Pauline texts have the same value: they are a firm declaration of God's saving power. That is in line with the whole biblical conception of the term, with the two texts where ἔσται is used and with Paul's unwavering conviction about the reality of Christ's redeeming work which is on its way to final victory.

The optative δώη in 2 Thess. 3:16, cf. Num. 6:26, does not militate against this interpretation. Paul hopes that the Lord of peace will give peace in every manner (that is the important point!) and he can express this wish just because he is sure that this Lord *is* "with them".

It is usual in this and other cases to add in translating the subjunctive "be", but that can only be done because the phrase "the Lord with you" is considered just a pious exclamation (just as in Dutch the saying "Adieu" in bidding farewell has lost its value) and is completely under-estimated.

In passing I may say that the final greetings have the same force: "the grace of the Lord is with you all". The subjective interpretation falls short of the certitude of Paul's faith. As a last farewell he assures the readers again of the sole, but firm ground of their Christian existence, cf. Acts 20:32. In all probability stress must be laid on the word "all".

A parallel may be drawn from the use of "peace" in greetings. This word has a strong dynamic force, as was clearly pointed out by W. S. van Leeuwen (p. 389, note 67). The peace given in greeting is not a desired thing, but an existing reality: it is sent out and may come back to the giver, Luke 10:5; its working depends on the receiver, but there is no doubt about the reality of the gift.

This "being of God with the Christians" is the present reality of the Holy Spirit in the church. The proof is found in 1 Cor. 14:25. In a church-gathering the Spirit gives prophetic power to the believers by which they reveal the secrets of the unbeliever's heart. This is so surprising and shocking to him that thereby he is moved to adoration, "declaring that *God is among you* indeed" (ὄντως = in reality and not only professed). This recognition of the divine presence is well known from the OT (p. 372 f.)[70]. Here the presence of the Lord is bound up with the prophetic experience (p. 374 ff.) and manifests itself to the outsider. This picture of a service in the apostolic age shows that these Christians came together in a pneumatic atmosphere, filled by the Pneuma of God (cf. also 2 Cor. 1:21 f.: "He that stablisheth us with you in Christ, and *anointed* us, is God who also sealed us and gave us the earnest of the *Spirit* in our hearts").

(8) 2 Tim. 4:22: "*The Lord with thy spirit.* The grace with you all." This combination of singular and plural form is somewhat surprising, especially after this personal letter. It is found in all three Pastoral Epistles, highly interesting being Tit. 3:15. It is an indication that these personal letters were also meant to be read in the community. Is "with thy spirit" here the same as "with you"? One is led to think so, because in some greetings Paul writes: "the grace with you all", but in Gal. 6:28; Phil. 4:23; Philem. 25 "the grace with your spirit"[71]. One may say that there is identity, but not in the sense that "thy spirit" = 'thyself' (see p. 364), but that "you" are the Christians, i.e. men and women endowed with the Spirit (see above and 1 Cor. 5:5; 1 Thess. 5:23). Now, there is a diversity of gifts of the Spirit (1 Cor. 12:4 ff.) and therefore it is possible that Paul is thinking here of the divine assistance to Timothy's special charisma, cf. 1 Tim. 4:14; 2 Tim. 1:6 f. For the discharge of his task Timothy will need fortitude, wisdom, longsuffering, etc. It is an assurance that there is no reason to fear; an assurance also of God's protection and blessing for his work (cf. 2:22 ff.).

> In the so-called "Apostolic Fathers" there is only one text with the expression which may be mentioned here: Barnabas 21:9: "the Lord of glory and all grace with your (plur.) spirit." This final greeting is not copied from one of the NT texts. "Spirit" must be here the spirit living in the church as a whole to which this letter is addressed. The words following the admonition: σώζεσθε, "children of love and peace", are an assurance, that He Who has given love and peace can preserve them, safe and well, for the coming Age.

In reviewing these texts from the NT[72] we discover that in the light of OT usage they receive their full force. The phrase is like a short-hand note. At face-value it does not seem of great importance and is therefore passed over in the commentaries. On closer inspection, however, it turns out that the NT authors themselves understood its full meaning perfectly well and were sure that their readers would understand it as well. They did not use an out-worn phrase, but wrote it down as expressing a self-evident truth. There is a marked difference here from later Judaism (p. 376). In its humble wording it contains the fullness and certitude of the Christian faith.

Jesus, the Messiah = Christ = Anointed One with the Spirit, the mediator of the new Covenant, is the IMMANUEL and does His work of salvation; His followers, anointed with the Spirit, form the new Israel and stand in the line of the prophets, heroes and kings of the old Israel, obedient to God's will and assured by His blessing.

Let us now turn back to our starting-point: the dialogue between minister and congregation.

In the course of our argument many passages with the phrase: "the Lord with somebody" were passed in review. They revealed a number of different applications of the same weighty conception. It will be impossible to use it inadvertently. It is impermissible to confine the interpretation of the dialogue to the use of the phrase in greetings. As a matter of fact it only occurs in greetings in very few instances and there the contexts show the exceptional character of this salutation. The term defines *the dynamic activity of God's Spirit given to particular chosen individuals or the people of God, enabling them to do a work of God in word or deed by protecting, assisting and blessing them; this presence of the Spirit manifests itself in the individual and to the outside world.*

This is the answer to the third question, formulated on p. 364. These texts also solve the other riddles. The "Lord" is here not so much the Father or the Son; it is the manifestation of the Lord in the Spirit (cf. 2 Cor. 3:17, an interpretation of an OT text!). The greeting is a declaration (p. 374 f.) that the Spirit of God is really present. The response of the congregation is very much to the point: when the minister assures them of the presence of the Spirit who "is with them", i.e. with their spirit as Christian folk, they in their turn assure him of the same divine assistance with his spirit, he having a special charisma[73] and standing in need of that assistance because of his prophetic work.

This dialogue has not been made after a biblical model, since that is not found anywhere. But it is deeply rooted in the biblical revelation. It has been formulated by the early Christians led by a deep experience of the Spirit. In the present state of the available material it is impossible to say when or where it first took shape. It has no parallels in the world of Greek or Jewish religion. It is a spontaneous creation of the Christian Church.

These short sentences which for the first time are met as an introduction to the Prayer of Thanksgiving (εὐχαριστία) are, if properly understood, highly significant for the ancient church service. There we find its *Sitz im Leben*. Other texts from the first and second centuries will help us to understand more fully in what surroundings it originated.

On the early Christians the new era had dawned. For them the New Covenant had come, "not of the letter, but of the Spirit" (2 Cor. 3:6). This explains why in the NT the phrase has again its full weight and connection with the Spirit, while in later Judaism it had lost this relation (p. 371 f.). The early Christians lived under the guiding inspiration of the Holy Spirit. That was not only so in the apostolic age, but also in later generations. It is often said that after the time of the apostles there is a

decline of charismatic force; that Christian life becomes more institutionalized. To a certain extent that may be true, but on the other hand it must be said that we often get a false picture through the fragmentary state of the surviving source-material. Yet even so there are sufficient statements about the living experience of the Spirit in the church. 1 Clement 2:2 shows this, when he speaks about a "full effusion of the Holy Spirit on all" (cf. also 46:6). Much illustrative and relevant material has been collected long ago by Weinel in an excellent book that is unduly neglected at present[74].

Christian worship, too, stood in this magnetic field of the Holy Spirit, and was its centre. This determining factor of the early liturgy is often overlooked in recent discussion of this subject. Prayer especially is a work of the Spirit. This is conspicuous in Paul. Two passages in Rom. 8 help us to see the background of the dialogue: vv. 15 f.: "Ye received the *spirit of adoption, whereby we cry*, Abba, Father. *The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit*, that we are children of God", and v. 26 f.: "In like manner the Spirit also helpeth our infirmity; for we know not how to pray as we ought: but *the Spirit himself maketh intercession for us* with groanings which cannot be uttered; and he who searcheth the hearts knoweth what is the mind of the Spirit, because he maketh intercession for the saints according to the will of God." To offer a right prayer, acceptable to God, the assistance of the Holy Spirit is necessary; it must be a combined action of Divine and human spirit. This "spiritual" character of prayer comes to light also in 1 Cor. 14:14 f. It is typical of Christian prayer, as Harder in his important monograph has rightly observed[75], and must be explained not from Hellenistic presuppositions about "spiritualization", but from the basic idea of the New Covenant. Very relevant also is Eph. 5:18: "Be filled with the *Spirit*, speaking one to another in psalms and hymns and *spiritual* songs (i.e. inspired by the Spirit) ... *giving thanks* always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ to God the Father"; 2:18: "for through Him (Jesus, our peace) we both (Christians from Jewish and pagan stock) have *in one Spirit* our access unto the Father", and 6:18: "With all prayer and supplications praying at all seasons *in the Spirit.*" This effectual presence of the Spirit in a church service is brought out by 1 Cor. 14:25 (see p. 380).

This feeling of the presence of the Spirit during divine worship continued in later times. One of the rules in Hippolytus' Church-Order says: "They shall be zealous to go to the assembly (ἐκκλησία) where the Spirit abounds" (Lat. tr., *floret*)[76]. A text from the prophet Hermas (middle second century) is very enlightening[77]. In picturing the difference between the true and the false prophet he lets the former "having the Divine Spirit" enter "into an assembly of righteous men who have faith

in the Divine Spirit''; when ''this assembly offers up prayer to God, then the angel of the prophetic Spirit who is destined for him, fills the man: and the man being filled with the Holy Spirit speaks to the multitude as the Lord wishes'' (*Mand.*, xi 9)[78]. This prophet does not speak on his own authority; what he potentially possesses is suddenly stirred up when the assembly is praying. In the case of the false prophet that does not happen, but then ''the earthly spirit flees from him through fear, and that man is made dumb'' (§ 14). The true prophet finds a sympathetic environment in such an assembly, but the spirit of the false prophet cannot stand it: ''the empty prophets, when they come to the spirits of the righteous, are found on leaving to be such as they were when they came'' (§ 15); in the Spirit from God there is power, but the earthly spirit is powerless (§ 17). The critical moment for the prophet is that of prayer; then the whole meeting-place is filled with the Spirit and the spirit of the incoming prophet must be in tune with that of the congregation. For effective prayer an interplay between the Holy Spirit and that of man is indispensable. This becomes clear from the previous Mandatum. Here Hermas combats grief, because it crushes out the Holy Ghost ''which was given to man a cheerful spirit'' and he continues: ''Grieving the Holy Spirit he works iniquity, neither entreating the Lord nor giving thanks[79] to Him. For the entreaty of the sorrowful man has no power to ascend to the altar of God''[80]. The reason for this is that a mixture of grief with this entreaty makes it impure; grief cannot be mixed with the Holy Spirit any more than vinegar with wine (*Mand.*, x 3)[81]. This grief is a sister of doubt and anger; people like Hermas do not understand, because their minds are occupied with worldly business[82]. ''Those, on the other hand, who have the fear of God, and search after Godhead and truth, and have their hearts turned to the Lord (καὶ τὴν καρδίαν ἔχοντες πρὸς κύριον)[83], quickly perceive.... For where the Lord dwells, there is much understanding'' (*Mand.*, x 1). The ''Holy Spirit'' here is that which dwells in man (*Mand.*, x 2, 5) and is subject to all sorts of human emotions. This peculiar conception[84] is clearly conceived by Hermas as the characteristic Christian ''spirit'' which the newly-baptized has received as that element which stamps him as a Christian (cf. p. 380). The sequence of thought in Hermas often lacks clearness. But in the main his way of looking at things is simple: in the Christian dwells the ''Holy Spirit'', given by God to make him pure, obedient to God's will, together with all sorts of other ''spirits'', leading forces; for a prayer acceptable to God this ''Holy Spirit'' must be free from other influences; when the Christian comes to the church, where other Christians, the people of God, are gathered, and the Holy Spirit in its fulness is present, then it becomes clear whether the individual ''spirit'' is in tune with the Holy Spirit.

This conception of prayer and service was not a private idea of Hermas. In *Didache*, x 7, it appears that saying the "eucharist" was not bound to certain formularies, if a prophet was doing it[85]. This presupposes that it was part of the activity of the Spirit. From Tertullian, *De Oratione*, 16, it follows that Hermas had a very deep influence upon the practice of prayer[86], and though Tertullian combatted this slavish imitation of the Roman author, he shares with him certain important ideas[87].

The material available for the reconstruction of the history of the liturgy does not enable us to determine the exact date and place of the origin of the dialogue. It may be anywhere in the first or second century. The connections with ideas in Hermas make a date in the middle of the second century quite probable.

Within the picture presented to us by Hermas, the dialogue finds its natural place and explanation[88]. A real Eucharist (prayer of thanksgiving) can only be offered in the right spiritual atmosphere both in the congregation as a whole and in its individual members. And "spiritual" means here that the Spirit of God is present; He is the life-blood of the church. That Spirit must flow and not be hampered by emotions and worldly thoughts. That spirit has been given, but must be vivified.

The Lord with you, says the minister with a word of assurance: here where the people of God is gathered in the name of Jesus IMMANUEL the dynamic presence of the Spirit is found which enables them to perform the holy work of the spiritual sacrifices; He assists these weak men and women; He will keep their spirits in the right condition.

And with thy spirit, rings the answer: like them the minister called to that work of the Spirit, to say the prayer, needs to be assured of that assisting power of the Spirit which keeps his spirit from all worldly thoughts, etc.

Lift up your hearts, now calls the minister: when the church again sees what it means to be the church of Christ and stands in the right atmosphere, they are called to direct their hearts[89] to the heavenly altar where the prayers are offered.

We lift them up unto the Lord, is their answer: to Him, Whom they are about to thank for His wonderful work in creation and re-creation. After this preparation the Thanksgiving can be said.

If this spiritual background has been discovered one also understands how this same introduction can be used before the reading of the Gospel. "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God: for they are foolishness unto him; and he cannot know them, because they are spiritually judged" (1 Cor. 2:13). The history and work of Jesus Who was anointed with the Spirit is pre-eminently spiritual[90].

Is everyone in our churches where these old and revered words are repeated hundreds of times aware of their deep, heart-searching

meaning? I wish they were. But if not, let these words not be used in vain, for "the letter killeth, but the Spirit giveth life". That is a judgment and the hope of the Church!

NOTES

* Appeared in: *New Testament Essays. Studies in Memory of Thomas Walter Manson 1893-1958*, ed. A. J. B. Higgins, Manchester 1959, p. 270-305.

[1] *Dienstboek voor de Nederlandse Hervormde Kerk* (*in ontwerp*), 's-Gravenhage 1955, p. 9, 11, 13, etc. The legend of Dutch silver coins has also 'God zij met ons' (God be with us), and as my colleague Prof. Quispel reminded me, the same version "Gott mit uns" was on the belts of German soldiers, even during the Nazi period. The origin of these applications cannot be traced here; it is however interesting to see the application of the same formula in widely divergent places.

[2] Tertullian, *De virg. vel.* 1: *Sed dominus noster Christus veritatem se, non consuetudinem, cognominavit.* This is still a valuable, all-too-often forgotten rule.

[3] J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum Solemnia*[2], 1949, vol. i, p. 447.

[4] Hippolytus, *Apostolic Tradition*, ed. G. Dix, 1937, p. 7, cf. also p. 39, 50. Because the salutation is always regarded as a special unit, I will do the same. At the end of this paper however it will be seen (p. 385) that the two parts in Hippolytus belong together and cannot be separated.—On various forms of the "Sursum Corda", see C. A. Bouman, 'Variants in the Introduction to the Eucharistic Prayer', *V.C.* 4 (1950), p. 97 ff.

[5] The material has been collected in a very convenient form by K. Frör, *Salutationen, Benediktionen, Amen*, in K. F. Müller-W. Blankenburg (eds.), *Leiturgia, Handbuch des evangelischen Gottesdienstes*, 1955, vol. ii, p. 570-81.—In the course of the following discussion I refer to Jungmann and Frör, because they offer the latest and most complete discussion of the subject.—In passing it may be remarked that the short article of H. Leclerq, 'Dominus Vobiscum', in: F. Cabrol-H. Leclercq, *Dictionnaire d'archéologie chrétienne et de liturgie*, is quite unsatisfactory.

[6] Cf. K. Frör, op. cit., p. 575, n. 33: "In der Geschichte der Salutationen sind viele und wesentliche Zusammenhänge noch nicht geklärt".

[7] Though the ascription of this reconstructed work to Hippolytus by Schwarz and Connolly has been challenged, I believe with the majority of scholars at present that it is correct.

[8] P. Morrishoe, 'Dominus Vobiscum', in: *Catholic Encyclopedia*, v, p. 114 writes: "Its origin is evidently Scriptural, being clearly borrowed from Ruth ii 4 and 2 Paral. xv 2."

[9] Biblical texts are quoted from the Revised Version; in some places, however, I have left out the copula in order to bring out the original wording.

[10] K. Frör, op. cit., p. 575.

[11] J. A. Jungmann, op. cit., p. 448.—On p. 446 ff. he mentions several other explanations, e.g.: "dass ... wenn der Priester das Gebet aller Gott darbringt, der Herr ihnen nahe sein und Gottes Gnade Ihr Beten begleiten möge", but he remarks that this idea does not explain the *greeting*-form.

[12] K. Frör, op. cit., p. 573; this last interpretation is quoted from the German liturgical reformer Wilhelm Löhe (1853).—Frör's parallel with the *Maranatha* is derived from Wetter; this Swedish scholar (*Altchristliche Liturgien*, I *Das christliche Mysterium* (1921)) gave an interpretation of the early Christian liturgy as an ancient mystery-cult; though his book contains several interesting observations, his method was arbitrary and his views have rightly been abandoned.

[13] It is of course certain that Paul wanted his letters to be read to the whole congregation and even to others (Col. 4:16), but is it reasonable to suppose that 1 Cor. was read as an introduction to a communion service? It would take us too far, if we were to discuss this point here; let it only be said that the chronological difference should not be overlooked.

[14] A farewell greeting with religious content, like our Dutch "Adieu" (= à Dieu) or the old "God bless you" and "God speed" are greetings that can only be used in that situation. The meaning does not depend on the form, but on the situation.

[15] Neither W. O. E. Oesterley, *The Jewish Background of the Christian Liturgy*, 1925, nor C. W. Dugmore, *The Influence of the Synagogue upon the Divine Office*, 1944, mentions it.

[16] Cf. W. Ewing, 'Greeting', in: J. Hastings, *DCG*, 1906, i, p. 692 f.

[17] The rabbinic material in SB I, p. 380 ff., on Matt. 5:47 and II, p. 584 f., on John 20:19.—Billerbeck mentions one text, *Mishna Berakoth*, IX 5, where influence of Ruth 2:4 is found, but he adds: it "ist so unbestimmt gehalten, dass sie ziemlich wertlos erscheint. In der rabbin. Literatur haben wir kein Beispiel gefunden, dass man sich beim Gruss irgendwie nach jener Verordnung gerichtet hätte."—In the OT the formula "Peace on you" is the usual form of greeting, Gen. 43:23; Judges 19:20; 1 Sam. 25:6, etc.; see the important pages on greeting written by J. Pedersen, *Israel, its Life and Culture*, 1926, I-II, p. 202 f., 303 f., 524 f.—In the other Semitic languages the same form is found.

[18] See also *Acta Thomae* 27: "And the Lord was revealed to them by a voice, saying: Peace be unto you, brethren" (tr. M. R. James, p. 376) after the sealing of Gundaphorus and Gad. Later on they see the appearance of a youth who is Jesus. Cf. with this the use of the Dialogue in Hippolytus, ed. Dix, p. 39.

[19] Cf. Jungmann, op. cit., p. 449.

[20] F. Blass and A. Debrunner, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik*[7], 1943, § 442, 10: "und ebenso".

[21] So Chrysostomus, *In 2 Tim. hom.* 10, 3 (PG, 62, p. 659), as cited by Jungmann, op. cit., p. 449, n. 16, and Theodorus Mops., *Commentary on the Lord's Prayer and on the Sacraments*, ed. A. Mingana, 1933, (vol. VI of *Woodbrooke Studies*), p. 90 ff.: he speaks of "an ordinance found in the church from the beginning".

[22] Especially in the citing of OT texts, see W. Foerster in *TWNT* III, p. 1085 ff.

[23] So by Jungmann, op. cit., p. 449 and F. L. Cross (ed.), *The Oxford Dictionary of the Christian Church*, 1957, p. 414, s.v. *Dominus Vobiscum*.

[24] Cf. the Hebrew Lexicon of L. Köhler, that on the NT by Walter Bauer and the Syriac of J. Payne Smith, s.vv.

[25] It is significant that the voluminous *TWNT* does not contain the word μετά and has nothing relevant under εἰμί in vol. II, p. 396 ff.

[26] A. H. McNeile, *The Gospel according to St. Matthew*, 1915, p. 437.—Cf. the interesting remark of the Syriac Didascalia 21, ed. R. H. Connolly (1929), p. 180. "But now *by His working is He with us, but visibly He is absent*, because He has ascended to the heights of heaven and sat at the right hand of His Father."

[27] C. H. Dodd, 'Matthew and Paul', in: *New Testament Studies* (1953), p. 61.

[28] O. Michel, 'Der Abschluss des Matthäusevangeliums', in: *Evangelische Theologie* 10 (1950-51), p. 16-26, n. 86.—*BGDW*, 1957, col. 1006, gives the translation "Beistand"; that is right so far as it goes, but not sufficient, as the rest of this paper will prove.

[29] Cf. G. F. Moore, *Judaism*, 1932, I, p. 434 ff. and index, II, p. 446, s.v., 'Name', I, p. 429 f.

[30] E.g. 1 Chron. 4:10; Luke 1:66; Acts 11:21, and the note of A. Plummer, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 1922, p. 38.

[31] Cf. Moore, *op. cit.*, I, p. 401 ff.; Th. C. Vriezen, *Hoofdlijnen der Theologie van het Oude Testament*[2], 1954, p. 259.

[32] See *Epist. Jer.* 6 to the exiles in Babylon: "For my angel is with you".—*Apoc. Abrah. X*, transl. G. H. Box, London 1919, p. 79: "Stand up, Abraham! Go without fear; be right glad and rejoice; and *I am with thee*", says the angel Jaoel, bearer of the ineffable Name (p. 46) who has "been sent to thee to strengthen thee and bless thee in the name of God."—In Hermas, *Mand.* V 1:7, VI 2:3, XII 3:3; *Sim.* V 3:4, V 7:6 speak of the guiding angel of Hermas.

[33] C. H. Dodd, *The Apostolic Preaching and its Developments*, new edn. 1944, p. 27 f.

[34] The great attention given here to Joseph makes him a type of Christ, who also suffered from the zeal of his brethren (Matt. 27:18), Whose way went through ignominy to glory (Luke 24:26); cf. also Acts 7:9 f., 10:38; Luke 2:52.

[35] 1 Sam. 10:6 f. LXX: καὶ ἐφαλεῖται ἐπὶ σὲ πνεῦμα κυρίου καὶ προφητεύσεις μετ' αὐτῶν καὶ στραφήσῃ εἰς ἄνδρα ἄλλον. καὶ ἔσται ὅταν ἥξει τὰ σημεῖα ταῦτα ἐπὶ σέ, ποίει πάντα, ὅσα ἐὰν εὕρῃ ἡ χείρ σου, ὅτι θεὸς μετὰ σοῦ = Josephus, *Ant.* VI 7:2, § 56-57, καὶ γενόμενος ἔνθους προφητεύσεις σὺν αὐτοῖς, ὡς πάνθ' ὕντιν' οὖν ὁρῶντα ἐκπλήττεσθαί τε καὶ θαυμάζειν, λέγοντα πόθεν εἰς τοῦτ' εὐδαιμονίας ὁ Κείσου παῖς παρῆλθεν· ὅταν δέ σοι ταῦτα γένηται τὰ σημεῖα, τὸν θεὸν ἴσθι μετὰ σοῦ τυγχάνοντα.

[36] Because the early Christians read the Bible in its Greek form, we take the LXX as a basis. In most cases the expression renders *hāyāh 'im*; sometimes like Gen. 21:20, 39:2-3; Judges 1:19; Hag. 1:13, 2:4 it stands for the preposition *'eth*, without change of meaning. In Joshua 22:31 it is a translation of *b'thûkh*; in Num. 14:42; Deut. 1:42 of *b'kirb'khem*. In Gen. 35:3 LXX has an interesting explanatory gloss: MT God "was with me in the way which I went" = LXX ἦν μετ' ἐμοῦ καὶ διέσωσέν με ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ. It is added by the LXX in Esther 6:13; Isa. 58:11 and Jer. 1:17; the texts in Judith and 3 Macc. are of course additional material of LXX.

[37] For the sake of completeness, since not all texts can be mentioned in the text, I give here the full list of texts where the expression is found in the OT. The distribution is interesting (see p. 372): Gen. 21:20, 22, 26:3, 24, 28, 28:15, 20, 31:3, 5, 13, 35:3, 39:2, 3, 21, 23, 48:21; Exod. 3:12, 10:10, 18:19; Num. 14:42, 23:21; Deut. 1:42, 2:7, 20:1, 31:23, 32:12; Joshua 1:5, 9, 17, 3:7, 6:27, 7:12, 14:12, 22:31; Judges 1:19, 2:10, 6:12, 13, 16; Ruth 2:4; 1 Sam. 3:19, 10:7, 16:18, 17:37, 18:14, 28, 20:13 (28:16); 2 Sam. 5:10, 7:3, 9, 14:17; 1 Kings 1:37, 8:57, 11:38; 2 Kings 18:7; 1 Chron. 11:9, 17:2, 8, 22:11, 16, 18, 28:20; 2 Chron. 1:1, 13:12, 15:2, 9, 17:3, 19:11, 20:17, 25:7, 32:8, 35:21, 36:23; 1 Ezra 1:25, 2:3; 2 Ezra 1:3; Esther 6:13; Judith 5:17, 13:11; 3 Macc. 6:15; Ps. 22 (23):4, 45(46):8, 12, 90(91):15; Amos 5:14; Hag. 1:13, 2:4; Zech. 8:23, 10:5; Isa. 8:8, 10, 43:2, 5, 58:11; Jer. 1:8, 17, 19, 15:20, 20:11, 26:28, 49:11.

[38] Cf., e.g., G. E. Wright, *God who acts*, 1952; J. de Groot-A. R. Hulst, *Macht en wil, de verkondiging van het O. T. aangaande God*, n.y.

[39] G. H. Dalman, *Aramäisch-neuhebräisches Handwörterbuch*[2], 1922, p. 296 b.

[40] *Midrash Rabbah, Genesis*, tr. H. Freedman, 1939, II, p. 633, 637 f., 701 f.—In Gen. 31:5 *'immādhî* was read as *'immūdhî* my pillar, support, l.c., 677.

[41] *Midrash Rabbah, Exodus*, tr. S. M. Lehrman, 1939, p. 63.

[42] *Midrash Rabbah, Genesis*, p. 807.

[43] See E. Schürer, *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*[3-4], 1901, p. 303.

[44] A well-known Greek combination, see: H. G. Liddell-R. Scott, *A Greek-English Lexicon* (1940), II, p. 1260, and frequent in Josephus, cf. A. Schlatter, *Die Theologie des Judentums nach dem Bericht des Josephus*, 1932, p. 37, 96 ff.

[45] In *Ant.* XIII 10:7 § 300 speaking about the three offices God had given to John Hyrcanus (high-priest, king and prophet), he says: συνῆν γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸ θεῖον, καὶ τὴν τῶν μελλόντων πρόγνωσιν παρεῖχεν αὐτῷ τ' εἰδέναι καὶ προλέγειν, = B.J. I, 2, 8, § 69, ὡμίλει γὰρ αὐτῷ τὸ δαιμόνιον ὡς μηδὲν τῶν μελλόντων ἀγνοεῖν. It is remarkable that it is not the phrase εἶναι μετά which is used, but συνεῖναι. Was the latter expression more appropriate-according to Josephus, more intimate? If this inference is correct it sheds some light upon our investigation.

[46] See above, p. 364.

[47] Th. C. Vriezen, *Oud-Israelietische Geschriften*, 1948, p. 220; H. H. Rowley, *The Growth of the Old Testament*, 1950, p. 150; O. Eissfeld, *Einleitung in das Alte Testament*, 1956, p. 595; all of post-exilic date with perhaps older material in it.

[48] The etymology of Boaz as "in him is power" is rejected as old-fashioned by H. A. Redpath, 'Boaz', in: *HDB* I, p. 308, but in the newest dictionary known to me: *Bijbels Woordenboek*, 1954-1957, col. 198 it is still maintained.

[49] See: Gen. 21:22, 39:2 (cf. v. 3); Num. 23:21; Deut. 2:7, 20:1; Joshua 22:31; 1 Sam. 10:7, 16:18, 18:28; 2 Sam. 5:10, 7:3; 1 Chron. 11:9, 17:2; 2 Chron. 1:1, 13:12, 15:9, 20:17, 35:21; Esther 6:13; Judith 13:11; Ps. 45(46):8, 12; Zech. 8:23; Isa. 8:8, 10; Jer. 20:11.

[50] εὐλογήσαι; for the ending see: Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., § 85.

[51] In view of Num. 10:35 f. (cf. A. H. Edelkoort, *Numeri* (1930), p. 118 f.) and 1 Sam. 4:6 as compared with vs. 3 one would have expected such a connection. But Num. 14:42; Deut. 1:42 show that there is no such direct relation. There is here also a distance between popular belief and God's revelation, as is clearly witnessed by Amos 5:14, cf. also Jer. 7. Obedience is essential (1 Sam. 15:22 f., important because the "being of God with him" plays such a large part in the story of Saul, p. 375 f.), cf. p. 369.

[52] Num. 14:42, 23:21; Deut. 1:42, 2:7, 20:1, 32:12; Joshua 7:12, 22:31; 1 Kings 8:57; 2 Chron. 25:7, 32:8; Judith 5:17, 13:11; 3 Macc. 6:15; Amos 5:14; Zech. 8:23, 10:5; Isa. 8:8, 10, 43:2, 5, 58:11; Jer. 49:11. Compare p. 388, n. 37.

[53] Cf. Pedersen, op. cit., III-IV, p. 35: "Yahweh's promise to be with Gideon means: that he needs the blessing for his deed, but it is further added that he is to act with a special force.... It was Yahweh's soul which filled him and was active in him."

[54] Moore, op. cit., I, p. 536 ff.

[55] F. Büchsel, *Der Geist Gottes im Neuen Testament*, 1926, p. 122.

[56] For late Jewish material see the references in *SB* IV, 2, p. 1229 f., Register s.v. Geist, heiliger; also H. Gunkel, *Die Wirkungen des heiligen Geistes nach der populären Anschauung der apostolischen Zeit und der Lehre des Apostels Paulus*[3], 1909, p. 50 f.; Büchsel, op. cit., p. 123 ff.

[57] See the article of O. Michel, quoted above p. 387, n. 28, adopted by J. Jeremias, *Jesu Verheissung für die Völker*, 1956, p. 33.

[58] It is interesting to see that Justin Martyr who quoted Isa. 7:14 on several occasions (*Dial.* 43:8, 67:1, 71:3, 84) always cites the first half about the virgin birth only. In *Apol.* 33 the full text is quoted, though not with the name IMMANUEL (p. 368) but with the Greek translation; in the course of his explanation he speaks about the "power" of God by which it happened and cites Luke 1:31 f.; then he explains the name "Jesus" but does not speak about "God with us".

[59] The name "Jesus" is explained in Matt. 1:21; Matthew is the only one among the Evangelists who does so and this is the more striking since the idea of "saving" is not prominent in his gospel, see my paper: 'L'usage de σώζειν 'sauver' et ses dérivés dans les évangiles synoptiques, in: *La Formation des Evangiles*, 1957, p. 178 ff. [in *Sparsa Collecta* I, p. 16-34]. These names had a meaning which is of the utmost importance for the understanding of the gospel.

[60] Vs. 29 διελογίζετο ποταπὸς εἴη ὁ ἀσπασμὸς οὗτος, cf. p. 364 and 371 f.

[61] J. M. Creed, *The Gospel according to St. Luke*, 1930, p. 20: "The angel authenticates his message." Note the introduction with 'behold'. In the stories of Moses, Gideon, Saul and Jeremiah too one finds this authentication by a sign when they do not dare to believe the message.

[62] See *HRCS*, s.v.

[63] J. Behm in *TWNT* V, p. 812, and W. Bauer, op. cit., col. 1227, s.v. παράκλητος translate it by "Helfer"; He is called to the aid of the disciples.

[64] Cf. E. Benz, 'Paulus als Visionär', in: *Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur in Mainz*, Geisteswissenschaftliche Klasse 1952, No. 2, p. 81-121.

[65] RV translates "farewell", taking it in the ordinary Greek sense at the end of letters. In view of the following imperatives and Phil. 4:4 "rejoice" seems preferable; the greeting comes in vs. 13. This interpretation is given by H. Windisch, *Der zweite Korintherbrief*, 1924, p. 426 and E. B. Allo, *Second Epître aux Corinthiens*, 1956, p. 343.

[66] As far as Rom. 15:33 is concerned this depends of course on the decision whether Rom. 16 is taken as a separate epistle or as an original part of Romans. I do not accept the hypothesis that ch. 16 was an epistle to Ephesus, but cannot argue the question here, see: H. Lietzmann, *An die Römer*[3], 1928, p. 128 ff.

[67] See on the expression "God of peace", O. Michel, *Der Brief an die Römer* 1955, p. 337, n. 3; on "peace" the fine monograph of W. S. van Leeuwen, *Eirene in het Nieuwe Testament*, 1940 (Leyden thesis).

[68] See my remarks on 1 Thess. 5:23 in 'Aramaeismen bij Paulus', in: *Vox Theologica* 14 (1943), p. 122 f. [E.T. in: *Sparsa Collecta* I, p. 129-143].

[69] Blass-Debrunner, op. cit., § 128, 5 suggests that in Luke 1:28 we should add εἴη, as is usually done, but see above p. 373.

[70] Cf. Isa. 45:14; Zech. 8:23 and the commentary of J. Moffat, *The First Epistle of Paul to the Corinthians*, 1938, p. 224 f.; F. W. Grosheide, *De Eerste Brief aan de Kerk van Korinthe*, 1957, p. 371.

[71] See N. A. Waaning, *Onderzoek naar het gebruik van* ΠΝΕΥΜΑ *bij Paulus*, 1939 (thesis: Amsterdam Free University), p. 132 f.—In this text "your" is plural.

[72] We left one text undiscussed, Rev. 21:3, because it is purely eschatological and therefore on a different level from those we are discussing.

[73] Cf. the consecration prayers in the Church Order of Hippolytus. This is the origin of the patristic interpretation, p. 387, n. 21. The variety of the gifts of the one Holy Spirit is given by Paul, 1 Cor. 12:8 ff. and parallel texts.

[74] H. Weinel, *Die Wirkungen des Geistes und der Geister im nachapostolischen Zeitalter bis auf Irenäus*, 1899.

[75] G. Harder, *Paulus und das Gebet*, 1936, p. 163 ff.

[76] Cf. also the Syriac Didascalia ch. 1, ed. R. H. Connolly, 1929, p. 2: "God's planting and the holy vineyard of His Catholic Church, the elect who rely on the simplicity of the fear of the Lord, who by their faith inherit His everlasting kingdom, who *have received the power and fellowship of His holy Spirit*, and by Him are armed and made firm in the fear of Him", etc., and ch. 26, p. 246: "*A believer is filled with the Holy Spirit* and an unbeliever with an unclean spirit", etc.; the whole following paragraph is relevant, because it shows that this teaching was not a pious theory, but reality, for on that basis he combats the view of over-anxious people who want to re-introduce all sorts of baptismal rites in the Christian church, a Jewish practice which brings them again under the slavery of the "Second Legislation".

[77] I cannot remember having come across this text in recent discussions on the liturgy of early Christianity. This side of the picture is not found in Justin Martyr's famous account in his Apology, but it should not be forgotten that these contemporaries wrote for different readers, Justin's information being destined for outsiders, Hermas addressing his fellow-Christians. It may be, however, that Justin's phrase about the "president" who prays ὅση δύναμις αὐτῷ has a double meaning: not only according to his personal ability (cf. *Apol.* 13:1, 55:8, *Dial.* 80:3), but also according to the power of the Spirit granted to him (67:5).

[78] The English quotations are taken from the *Ante-Nicene Christian Library*, vol. I—Extremely helpful is the commentary of M. Dibelius, *Der Hirt des Hermas*, 1923, who pointed out the special character of this conception.

[79] For this translation see Dibelius, op. cit., p. 535.

[80] Prayers are conceived here as "spiritual sacrifices", see the note of E. G. Selwyn, *The First Epistle of St. Peter*, 1946, p. 160 ff. on 1 Pet. 2:5 and Tertullian, *De Oratione*, 28.

[81] Tertullian, *De Oratione*, 12.

[82] Cf. also Hermas, *Sim.* II 5 ff. about the prayer of the poor and the rich: "the poor man is rich in intercession and thanksgiving, and his intercession has great power with God ... the intercession of the poor man is acceptable and influential with God"; that of the rich man misses this power, because he is distracted by his riches and worldly cares, but he can be helped by giving alms to the poor man: "and the poor man, being helped by the rich, intercedes for him, giving thanks to God for him who bestows gifts upon him".

[83] Cf. the same expression in Hermas, *Vis.* III 10:9: "Your doubts make you senseless and the fact that you have not your hearts turned towards the Lord": Dibelius, following Funk here, refers to the "Sursum Corda". They are "senseless" as regards heavenly revelations: they are not understood, because there is doubt (the spirit is not in the right state) and their heart (see below, n. 89) is not directed towards the Lord. In the note of Dibelius the connection with the Preface is not clarified; there is no direct dependence on either side, but both spring from the same "spiritual" source.

[84] Cf. the interesting "Exkurs" of Dibelius on the Pneumatology of Hermas, op. cit., p. 517 ff.

[85] In *Did.* IX-X some formularies for the thanksgiving are given, but at the end it is said: "but permit the prophets to thank as much as they wish"; this is of course not the prophet's private wish; he speaks "in the Spirit". This rule resembles Justin's "according to his own ability" (*Apol.* 67:5) and that in Hippolytus' Church Order, ed. Dix, p. 19. These testimonies show that there was not yet any fixed formulary absolutely prescribed. Hippolytus has to shield bishops who use formularies against criticism, which shows that the general feeling was against these set forms. The fact that in Rome in the second century the bishops formulated the eucharistic prayer "according to their ability" puts them on a line with the prophets of the Didache; it shows again that this prayer was seen as an action inspired by the Holy Spirit.

[86] For the "mos quibusdam" to sit down on a couch after prayer they appealed to Hermas, *Sim.*, v 1; his book was considered part of Scripture, see the commentary of G. F. Diercks, *Tertullianus De Oratione*, 1947, p. 159 ff. (thesis: Amsterdam). The canonical authority of Hermas in many circles of the early church is well-known, see A. Harnack, *Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur*, Bd. I *Ueberlieferung und Bestand*, 1893, p. 51 ff. If, *teste* Tertullian, Hermas was followed in such a minor point, his ideas must have been very influential.

[87] See above, n. 81, cf. also ch. 1 and 28 f. for the primary importance of the Spirit in prayer.—In the writings of Tertullian there is no trace of the dialogue; see E. Dekkers, *Tertullianus en de geschiedenis der Liturgie*, 1947. This may be purely accidental in view of his works as a liturgical source. At any rate I do not venture to draw any inference from his silence.

[88] The "salutation" and the "sursum corda" are taken together, as they stand in Hippolytus, cf. p. 386, n. 4.

[89] W. Bauer, op. cit., col. 797: "Mittelpunkt u. Quelle des geistigen Lebens mit seinem Denken, Wollen, Fühlen ... beim natürl. wie beim erlösten Menschen."

[90] When we have so explained the meaning of the "Dominus vobiscum" and its legitimate place in the worship of the second-century church, it seems permissible to infer that the formulae of the Eastern Liturgies using the form with "Peace" or "the grace of the Lord with you" are later developments, adopting either the ordinary salutation or a more "rational" text (cf. p. 365) in the dialogue. If this inference is sound, it witnesses to a change in the conception of the Liturgy. The decision on this point must be left to further research.

INDEXES TO *SPARSA COLLECTA* I-III

PREFACE TO THE INDEXES

The Index of Passages only contains texts that are discussed or cited. Old Testament citations are numbered according to LXX; deviations from the Masoretic Text are indicated. The Index of Modern Authors mentions the authors, whose opinions are discussed or mentioned. The Index of Subjects only serves to supplement the table of contents. Some printing errors are indicated by an asterisk. The titles of the works of Philo are abbreviated according to TRE.

INDEX OF PASSAGES

1. BIBLE

A. Old Testament

Genesis
7:11 III 274
21:20 III 369
21:22 III 372
23:4 II 72
26:3 III 369
28:15 III 368
37:11 I 89
38:15 II 302
39:2-3 III 374
39:21 III 374
39:23 III 369; 374
41:38 III 374

Exodus
2:1-10 I 288; 290
2:23 ff III 321
3:6 II 302
3:11-12 III 368
3:12 I 54
6:6-7 III 153
12:5 II 17
14:8 II 299
17:14 I 218
19:5-6 I 181
19:10 II 62
19:14 II 62
23:22 (19, 5-6) II 63
24:3-8 II 62
24:7 II 165
28:12 I 219
28 (*27):23 (28, 29) I 219
30:16 I 219
34 I 185; 198; 199; 208
36:14 (39:7) I 219

Leviticus
2:2 I 219
2:9 I 219
2:16 I 219
5:12 I 219
6:15 (6, 8) I 220
17:7 II 14
19:18 II 66
22:17-25 II 37-40
23:12-13 II 17
23:24 I 220
24:7 I 228
26:12 I 181
26:33 II 244

Numbers
5 (*15):15 I 220
5 (*15):18 I 220
5 (*15):26 I 221
10:10 I 228
11:17 III 375
11:25 III 375
14:42 III 368
15:30 (targum) II 299
23:21 III 372
31:54 I 221
33:3 II 299

Deuteronomy
2:7 III 368
4:1-2 II 134; 139; 152
4:2 I 70
7:6 II 61; III 80
13:1 II 134; 139; 152
20:1 III 369
28:49 I 396
29:3 I 203
31:23 III 370
32:8 III 92
32:26 I 221
34:9 III 375

Joshua
3:7 III 369
4:7 I 221
22:31 III 372

Judges
2:18 III 368
5:9 (targum) II 299
6:12-13 III 369
6:12 III 371; 373
6:16 III 369; 372
6:34 III 375

Ruth
2:4 III 369; 371; 372; 373

1 Samuel
3:19-20 III 375
10:6-7 III 367; 375
10:6 II 264
11:11 II 243
16:13 II 264; III 375
16:14 III 375
16:18 III 369
17:37 III 368; 372
28:16 III 375

2 Samuel
7:12 ff II 261
12:3 I 307
15:30 II 302
22:36 II 60

1 Kings
11:20 I 307
12:8 I 308
11:38 III 370
17:8-10 I 335
19:13 II 302
19:16 II 265
19:19 II 265
22:17 II 243

2 Kings
10:6 I 308
18:7 III 369
23:2 II 165
23:21 II 165
25:5 II 243

1 Chronicles
22:16 III 373
22:18 III 368
28:20 III 369

2 Chronicles
1:1 III 369
15:2 III 370
15:9 III 372
19:11 III 370
20:9 III 347
20:17 III 369
32:8 III 368
34:30 II 165
35:21-22 III 375
35:21 III 369
36:23 III 373

1 Ezra
1:25 III 369
2:3 III 373
4:15 I 222

2 Ezra (Nehemiah)
1:3 III 373
12:20 (2, 20) I 221
19:20 (9, 20) III 375

Esther
1:15/1P I 222
2:23 I 222
6:1 (*11) I 222
6:1 (targum) I 247
6:12 II 302
7:8 II 303
9:32 (*31) I 222
10:2 I 222

Job
24:15 II 302

Psalms
2:7 II 261
22 (23):4 III 369
37 (38):1 I 229
37:6 (Mas.) II 100
38 (39):13 II 72; 73
48 (49):8-9 II 46; 47
69 (70):1 I 229
77 (78):23-24 III 274
85 (86):9 II 99
88 (89):4 I 66
88 (89):37 I 67-69
90 (91):15 III 368
108 (109) I 223
109 (110):4 I 66
134 (135): 6-7 I 396
138 (139):7-9 I 394

Proverbs
10:7 III 320
30:6 (24, 29) II 134

Ecclesiastes
3:14 II 135; 152

Isaiah
6:2 II 302
6:3 III 330; 341; 351
8:9 I 396
9:6 I 66
10:3 II 98
23:18 I 223
24:18 III 274

25:7-8 II 304
29:10 I 203; II 303
35:5-6 I 54
37:32 I 31
43:1-2 III 368
43:20-21 II 64
44:3 III 375
45:21-22 I 396
48:20 I 396
49:6 I 364; 397
52:3 II 11; 17; 29
52:5 II 310
53 II 33
53:7 II 17; 18-19
57:8 I 223
59:2 I 221
62:11 I 397
63:19 (64:1) I 239; III 274
66:3 I 223

Jeremiah
1:8 III 369
6:15 II 98
6:22 I 397
10:12 I 397
10:15 II 98
13:24 II 243
14:3-4 II 302
15:20 III 368
16:19 I 397
20:11 III 368
27 (50):41 I 397
28 (51):16 I 397
31:31 ff (Mas.) I 179; 180; II 166-167
33 (26):2 II 135
38 (39):8 I 398

Ezekiel
1:1 III 274
3:22-23 I 366
36:20-23 II 320
36:24 ff I 181; II 167
37:25 I 66

Daniel
4:28 I 89
7:4 I 66
7:10 III 340; 341; 343
7:28 (Theodot.) I 89

Hosea
12:6 (*5) I 223
14:8 I 223

Joel
2:28 II 167
2:32 II 245

Amos
5:14 III 370

Obadiah
17 II 245

Jonah
1:1-3 I 336
3:1-3 I 336

Habakkuk
1:2 III 347
2:4 I 155
3:18 I 28

Haggai
1:13-14 III 375
2:4-5 III 370; 375

Zechariah
8:23 III 372

Malachi
1:6-7 II 313
3:16 I 223-224

B. New Testament

Matthew
1:18 III 377
1:20 III 377
1:21 I 27
1:23 III 376
3:16 I 239; III 276
5:16 II 96; 205
5:17 III 8
5:38 ff I 113-114
5:44 ff I 112
5:46 I 126
7:13-14 II 206
8:5 ff I 27
8:25 I 26
9:12-13 II 206
9:18 I 24
9:20 ff I 19
9:27-31 I 25
10:17 ff II 283
10:22 I 25
10:39 I 20
11:5 II 266

11:9 I 150
12:9-13 I 23
12:18 III 377
12:28 II 267; III 377
14:30 I 26
14:36 I 26
16:17 II 259
16:25 I 20
18:11 I 31-32
18:12-14 III 177
18:19-20 III 377
19:25 I 21
23:36 I 150
24:13 I 25
24:22 III 219
24:23 f II 262
24:22 I 26
25 II 87
26:13 III 319
26:67 I 3-5
27:39 ff I 21-23
28:20 III 365; 376

Mark
1:10 III 276
1:27 II 327
3:4 I 23
3:21-22 II 267
4:11 III 290
4:34 III 290
4:38 I 26
5:16 I 27
5:23 I 24
5:25 ff I 19
6:14 f II 262
6:56 I 26
8:28 II 262
8:32 II 271; 282
8:35 I 20
10:26 I 21
10:52 I 24-25
12:1 ff II 262
13:10 III 82
13:13 I 25
13:20 I 26; III 219
13:21-22 II 259
14:9 III 319
14:24 III 177
14:27 III 320
14:61 II 261
14:65 I 3-5
15:29 ff I 21-23

Luke
1:1-4 I 6-15; 37
1:1 I 340
1:3 I 372-373
1:28-38 III 377-378
1:31 I 28
1:32 II 264
1:35 II 264
1:47 I 28
1:66 I 87
1:69 I 28
1:71 I 28
1:77 I 28
2:8 II 264
2:10-20 I 72-73; 87
2:11 I 29
2:19 I 72-91
2:51 I 74
3:6 I 29
3:21-22 III 276
3:21 I 239
4:16 I 293
4:18 ff II 263
4:21 I 103
6:9 I 23
6:27 ff I 112; 113-114; 124
6:32-35 I 111-126
6:33-35 II 105
7:3 I 27
7:26 I 150
7:50 I 29
8:12 I 27
8:24 I 26
8:36 I 27
8:43 ff I 19
8:50 I 24
9:24 I 20
9:56 (v.l.) I 31-32
10:19 I 366
11:20 II 267
11:51 I 150
13:23 I 30
14:12 ff I 120
17:9 I 123
17:19 I 30
17:33 I 20
18:26 I 21
18:42 I 24-25
19:9-10 I 31-32
19:44 II 98
21:19 I 25
21:20 ff I 26
21:20 I 102
22:19 III 318
22:63 I 3-5
23:35 ff I 21-23
24:13-35 III 81
24:19 II 262
24:21 II 260

24:25 ff III 320
24:26 f II 260
24:44 ff II 260; III 320
24:47-48 I 368; 392

John
1 I 38
1:17 I 40
1:32 II 265
1:38 I 43
1:39 I 57
1:41 (*42) I 42-43; II 265
1:46 I 45
1:49 (*50) I 44
1:51 III 276
2:1-11 I 55
3:2 I 53; III 366-367
3:3 I 50
3:14 I 64
3:16-17 I 18
4:25 I 42-43
4:39 I 54
4:42 I 40; 42
4:48 I 54
5 I 52
5:18 I 56
5:24 III 153
5:36 I 53
5:39 I 45
7:3-4 II 284; 306
7:31 I 53
7:39 II 265; 327
7:42 I 68
8 I 52
8:17 I 52
8:28 I 64
8:29 III 378
8:48 ff II 267
9:4 I 53
9:22 I 58
10:16 I 59
10:20 f II 267
10:24 II 284
10:33 ff I 56
11:42 I 53
11:51-52 I 46
11:52 I 59
12:13 I 45
12:16 I 47
12:18 I 53
12:20 I 60
12:24 II 246
12:34 I 64-69
13:7 I 38
14:10-11 I 52
14:12-18 III 378
14:16 ff II 326
16:1 f I 58
16:13-14 II 329
16:32 III 378
17:3 I 40
18:20-21 II 285
19:19 ff I 45
20 II 328
20:24-29 I 41
20:30-31 I 35-63

Acts
1:1 I 7; 343-344; 360-363; 372-373
1:6 ff I 359
1:6 II 261
1:8 I 353; 354; 368; 386-401
2 I 257; II 328
2:22-36 II 257
2:36 II 257
2:42 III 242
2:46 II 241; 242
4:12 I 18; 365
4:13 II 279-280
4:19-20 I 338
4:26 f II 263
4:29-30 I 370-371
4:29 II 280
4:31 II 280
5:20 I 337
5:29-33 I 338
5:36 f II 262
5:39 I 338
6:9 I 299
6:10 II 283
6:15 I 208
7:9-10 III 366; 375
7:20-22 I 281; 287-288; 290; 292
7:51 I 339
7:56 III 277
8:1 II 242-247; III 97
8:3 II 242
8:4 II 242-247
8:9 ff I 404
8:25-26 I 332-333; 337; II 328
8:26-27 I 328-339
8:36 I 338
9:11 I 299
9:20-22 I 48
9:20 II 283
9:27 II 280
9:29 II 280
10 I 213-258; 338
10:2 I 248
10:4 I 213-253; III 319
10:11 II 328; III 277

10:13 ff I 337
10:22-28 I 249
10:28 III 311
10:34 I 253
10:35 I 253-258
10:38 II 264; 330; III 366; 367; 377
10:39-43 I 368
10:47 I 338
11:15 I 257
11:19 II 243-247
11 (*13):28 II 329
13:22-23 I 68
13:26-27 I 59
13:26 I 364
13:45 I 339
13:46-47 I 392-393
13:46 II 280
14:3 I 371
14:15 II 14
14:19 II 283
14:22 I 407
15:1 II 78
15:5 II 78
15:8 I 257
16:4 II 283
16:8 II 328
16:17 I 384
16:20-21 I 374-385
16:21 III 87
16:37 I 375
17:2-3 I 47-48; II 74
17:7 I 48
17:31 I 359
18:3 I 300
18:5 I 48
18:9-10 III 379
18:28 I 48
20:22-23 I 337
20:29-30 I 404-405
20:29 I 103
21:4 I 337
21:10-14 I 351
21:10 II 329
21:11 ff I 337
21:39 I 299
22:3 I 159; 263-327; II 204-205
23:11 I 369
23:16 ff I 283
23:16 I 300
24:24-25 I 351
26:4-5 I 296-299; 301
26 (*29):19 I 339
26:26 II 281
27:1-28:16 I 365-366
27 I 26
27:24-25 I 366
28 I 352; 391
28:24 I 339

Romans
1:2 I 177; II 260
1:3-4 II 257; 266
1:16 I 17
3:24-25 II 3
5:5 II 331
7 I 166
8 II 206
8:15-16 III 383
8:15 I 134
8:16 I 190; II 330
8:25 I 141
8:26-27 III 383
8:28 I 371
8:29 II 61
9-11 I 187
11:2 II 62
11:8 I 203; 204
11:27 I 187
13 II 107-108
13:5 III 345-346
13:8 I 141
13:12 I 167
14:16 II 316
15:7-9 I 153
15:8-9 I 187-188
15:33 III 379

1 Corinthians
1:6-8 I 154
1:17 (*16) I 139
1:18 I 17
1:21 II 230
1:23 II 260; III 321
2:2 I 164; II 260
2:4 II 328
2:9 III 350
2:13 III 385
3:16 II 329
5:3 II 331
5:5 I 137
5:7 II 17
6:12 I 140
6:19 II 329
6:20 II 11
7:3 I 141
7:23 II 11
10:32-33 II 315
11:2 ff II 223
11:4 II 304
11:7 I 209; II 304

11:24-26 I 140; III 318
11:25 I 176-177
11:26 III 321; 322
12:3 II 330
12:8 ff II 330-331
14:14-15 III 383
14:25 III 380; 383
14:33 II 314
15:3 ff II 230
15:3 II 260
15:49 III 262
15:50 III 254
15:55 II 304
16:22 I 134; 139

2 Corinthians
1-4 I 194
1:15-24 I 144-159; 198-199
1:21 (*22)-22 II 265; III 380
1:21 II 253
1:23 I 199
2:14 ff I 199
2:17 II 276
3:3 I 176; 185; II 330
3:5 I 199
3:6 I 174-177; 184-185; 196; II 330
3:7-11 I 199
3:12-18 I 194-210; II 276
3:12 I 200; II 292-294; 296-297
3:14 II 159; 164-165
3:17 I 185; 195; II 326; 330
3:18 I 169; 195; II 297
5:10 III 255
5:16 I 303
5:17 I 151; 167
6:2 I 103
6:16-18 I 186
6:16 II 329
7:4 I 200; II 276
13:11 III 379

Galatians
1:15 I 301
1:22 I 301
2:7 II 80
2:10 I 135
2:11 I 258
3 I 188
3:12 III 321
3:16 I 68
3:19 I 135
4:6 I 134; 190
5:3 II 60
5:22 (*23) II 331
6:9-10 II 105; 205
6:14 III 242

Ephesians
1:7 II 3
1:14 I 186
2:11-18 I 186-187
2:12 I 251
2:13 II 3
2:18 II 331; III 383
3:2 ff I 191
3:12 II 277
4:3 I 138
4:15 ff II 315
4:17 II 14; 15
5:3 ff I 166
5:16 I 138
5:18 III 383
5:32 III 292
6:4 I 309
6:18 III 383
6:19-20 II 277; 305

Philippians
1:14 II 278
1:18 II 278
1:20 II 277
2 II 258
2:15 II 316
3:5 I 301
3:12 I 167
4:8 II 103; 108
4:9 III 379

Colossians
1:14 I 173
1:15 III 153
1:19-20 I 138
1:19 III 292
2 III 24
2:7 I 154
2:11-13 II 78
2:12-13 III 254
2:15 II 278
3:15 I 138
3:20 III 254
4:4 II 277; 306
4:5 I 138; II 314-315

1 Thessalonians
1:4 I 191
2:2 II 275
2:4 II 307
2:15 II 256
4:11-12 II 314
5:11 I 135
5:23 I 136; 137

2 Thessalonians
2:1 I 184
3:13 II 105
3:16 III 379; 380

1 Timothy
1:15 III 7
3:7 II 316
3:13 II 278
4:1 III 117
6:1 II 316

2 Timothy
2:18 III 262
4:22 III 363; 381

Titus
1:16 II 317
2:5 II 317
2:8 II 317
2:10 II 317
2:11-14 I 169
2:14 II 11; 65
3:15 III 381

Philemon
8 II 276
20 I 139

Hebrews
2:2-5 I 361
2:3-4 II 328
2:17 III 176
4:16 II 286
6:4 II 330
9:12-14 II 3
9:14 II 17
9:26 II 17
10:19 II 286
10:35 II 286
12:17 II 64

James
2:7 II 317

1 Peter
1:1 II 71-74; 112; III 97; 98-99; 102
1:2 II 60-63; 112; 114-115
1:3 II 67
1:5 I 18
1:9 I 18
1:11 II 91
1:13-2:10 II 9; 10
1:14 II 32
1:17 II 6-7; 10; 31; 48
1:20-21 II 7; 9-10
1:20 II 61
1:22 II 59; 64
1:23 (*22) II 67
2:1 II 67
2:2 II 67
2:5 II 77
2:7 II 80
2:9-10 II 57
2:9 II 63; III 154
2:10 II 64; 80
2:11 II 72; 73
2:12 II 79; 96-100; 107
2:13-17 II 91-92; 108
2:14 II 106-110
2:18-25 II 92-93
2:19 ff I 118; 123
2:19 III 346
2:20 II 106-110
2:24 II 56
3:1-6 II 93-94
3:8-22 II 94-95
3:8 II 118
3:9 II 64
3:13 II 65
3:14 II 56
3:16 I 114; II 79
3:18 II 55
3:21 II 113
4:3 II 32
4:4 II 113
4:8 II 66; 102
4:12-19 II 95-96; 113
4:12-13 II 66
4:18 II 80
5:1 II 80
5:6 II 97; 119
5:9 II 112
5:12 II 75-76; 90; 116
5:13 II 69
5:14 II 112

2 Peter
1:10 III 127

1 John
1:7 II 4
2:28 II 287
3:8 III 7
3:14 III 255
3:16 III 127
3:21 II 287
4:17 II 287
5:14 II 287

Jude
18 III 117

Apocalypse
1:7 I 150
1:19 II 183; 184; 192
3:14 I 151
4:1 III 277
5 III 176
5:9 II 4
6:11 III 128
7:4 III 128
7:14 II 4
13:8 III 176
19:10 (*11) II 329
19:11 III 277
21:4-6 I 151
22:18-19 II 132; 133; 153; 154
22:20 I 151

2. JEWISH WRITINGS

A. *Apocrypha*

Tobit
3:16—I 227
12:12—I 226-227

Judith
13:11—III 368; 372

Wisdom of Solomon
7:4—I 314
7:17-21—II 183
10:8—I 226

Ecclesiasticus (Ben Sirach)
10:17—I 224
12:1 ff—I 117
18:5-6—II 135
23:26—I 224
24:20—I 224
24:23—II 165
35:6 (*9)—I 225
38:11—I 225
38:23—I 224
39:2—I 89
39 (*41):9—I 225
41:1—I 224
44 (*64):9—I 225
45:9—I 225
45:11—I 225
45:16—I 225
50:16—I 225

Baruch
4:5—I 226

1 Maccabees
1:57—II 165
3:9—I 398
8:30—II 149
11:33—I 116; 118

2 Maccabees
1:27—II 244
6:23—I 314

B. *Pseudepigrapha*

Apocalypse of Abraham 29—III 130

Apocalypse of Elijah 3-4—I 243

Ascension of Isaiah—III 196

Assumption of Moses
1:12—III 81
12:9-10—III 55

2 Baruch (Syr.)
14:12—II 89
22:1—III 275
23:4-5—III 130
24:1—I 243
51:3—I 209
84:10—I 233

3/4 Baruch (Greek) 11-15—I 241

1 Enoch
2-5—III 54-55; 56
13:9—II 302
14:15—III 275
41:5-8—III 55
47:1-4—I 232
49:1—I 66
62-63—II 99
81:2-4—I 233
94 ff—II 314
99:2—II 136
99:3—I 231
104:9—II 136
104:10-12—II 135-137

2 Enoch (Slav.)
19:5—I 243
48:7—II 139

4 Ezra
7:116 ff—I 167-168
8:11 f—I 30
8:28—I 233
4:33 ff—III 130

Jubilees
22:16 ff—I 183
23:1—II 303
30:23—I 243

Letter of Aristeas § 310-311—II 137

3 Maccabees
6:13—III 368
6:15—III 368
6:18—I 239; III 275; 277

4 Maccabees
10:2—I 314
11:15—I 314
16:8—I 314

Prayer of Asenath—I 314

Psalms of Solomon
1:4—I 398
3:8—III 76
8:15 (16)—I 398-399
17—I 45; III 81
17:4—I 66; 67; 88
17:32—II 265
18:12-14—III 55-56

Testaments of the XII Patriarchs
Levi
2:6—III 275
5:1—III 275
6:2—I 88
18:6—III 275
Judah
24:2—III 275
25:5—II 99
Naphtali
3—III 55
8:4—II 99
8:6—II 320
9:2—II 303

C. *Rabbinical writings*

a. MISHNAH

Shabbath 6:1—III 308
Pesachim 10:5—III 156; 324
Rosh ha-Shanah
1:2—I 235
6:2—I 236
Megillah 4:1—II 142
Sotah 9:15—II 303
Shebuoth 4:3—I 152
Aboth
2:1—I 243
5:21—I 294
Kerithoth 2:1—II 42
Mikwaoth
8:5—III 309
9—III 308

b. TOSEPHTA

Rosh ha-Shanah 1:12—I 236
Megillah 4:41 (229:1)—II 143

c. MEKILTA

on *Ex.* 14:8—II 299
on *Ex.* 15:2—II 320
on *Ex.* 17:8—II 299
on *Ex.* 18:6—II 55
on *Ex.* 20:25—I 137
on *Ex.* 21:30—II 46

d. SIFRA

on *Lev.* 1:2—II 60

e. BABYLONIAN TALMUD

Shabbath 118b—II 299
Erubin 13a—II 141
Rosh ha-Shanah
16a—I 236
28b—II 141
32b—I 235
Megillah 14a—II 140
Hagigah 14b—II 303
Yebamoth
46a—II 78
47a—II 66
47b—III 308
48b—II 67
Sotah
14a—II 89
20a—II 141
42b—II 299
Baba Kamma 82a-b—III 309
Baba Bathra

10b—I 252
21a—I 293
Sanhedrin
91—III 240
99a—III 351
Shebuoth 36a—I 152
Kerithoth 9a(81a)—II 42

f. PALESTINIAN TALMUD

Sanhedrin
X 27c—II 298
X 28c—I 242

g. MIDRASH RABBAH

Genesis R.
14:7—III 240
17—II 301
28:15—III 370
39:3—III 370
49:1—III 320
97—I 68
Exodus R.
3:12—III 370
30—II 61
Numbers R.
8—II 67
21:3—III 320
Deuteronomy R. 2—I 251
Ruth R. 2:4 (130b)—II 140
Songs of Songs R.
1:14 (93b)—I 179
7:1-2—III 145
Lamentations R. introd. 15—II 320

h. MIDRASH TEHILLIM

on *Ps.* 31:24—I 55
on *Ps.* 46—II 47
on *Ps.* 67:6—II 100

D. *Non-rabbinical writings*

a. PHILO

All.
1:31 (§ 99)—I 275
2:12 (§ 42)—II 188
Sacr. 1-2 (§ 1-9)—II 151
Det. 2 (§ 3)—III 370
Post. 23 (§ 80)—III 370
Agr. 17 (§ 78)—III 370
Conf. 38 (§ 196-197)—II 243
Migr. 11 (§ 62-63)—III 370
Fug. 25 (§ 140)—III 370
Som.
1:30 (§ 179)—III 370
2:21 (§ 147)—I 275
Vit. Mos.
1:2-7 (§ 5-32)—I 288-290
1:3 (§ 11)—I 309
2:6 (§ 34)—II 137-138
Spec. Leg.
1:9 (§ 51 ff)—II 57
1:57 (§ 309)—II 58
1:61 (§ 334)—II 188
4:27 (§ 143-147)—II 150-151
4:34 (§ 178)—II 58
Virt.
20-21 (§ 102-108)—II 58
33 (§ 175-179)—II 58
Praem. 26 (§ 152)—II 59
Aet. 22 (§ 113)—II 150
Flacc.
7 (§ 46)—I 275
17 (§ 139)—I 82
19 (§ 158)—I 275
Leg. Gai.
16 (§ 115)—I 294
36 (§ 277)—III 90
Ps.-Philo, *Ant. Bibl.* 12—I 198

b. JOSEPHUS

De Bello Judaico
I pr. 12 (§ 30)—I 9
I 33:1 (§ 647)—III 72
III 7:31 (§ 299)—I 83
III 8:3 (§ 352)—I 82; 84
VII 3:3 (§ 45)—II 55
VII 8:7 (§ 340 ff)—I 169-170
VII 8:7 (§ 381)—I 171
VII 9:1-2 (§ 389 ff)—I 171
VII 9:2 (§ 403)—I 82
VII 11:5 (§ 455)—I 9

Antiquitates Judaicae
pr.—I 9 ff
I pr. 2 (§ 7-9)—I 7
I pr. 3 (§ 17)—II 138
I 19:2 (§ 283)—III 371
II 2:4 (§ 17)—I 89
II 5:3 (§ 72)—I 78; 83
II 9:3-10:1 (§ 210-238)—I 290-291
II 10:1 (§ 238)—I 275
II 12:1 (§ 268)—III 371
V 6:2 (§ 213)—III 371
V 10:3 (§ 347)—I 310
VI 7:2 (§ 56-57)—III 388
VII 4:4 (§ 91)—III 371

VII 7:3 (§ 149)—I 307
VII 14:5 (§ 357)—III 371
VIII 7:6 (§ 201)—I 307
VIII 8:2 (§ 216)—I 307
IX 1:2 (§ 11)—III 371
IX 6:5 (§ 125)—I 308
IX 7:1 (§ 142)—I 314
X 4:3 (§ 65)—II 243
X 8:2 (§ 136)—II 244
X 10:4 (§ 207)—II 244
XII 2:12 (§ 109)—II 138
XII 10:6 (§ 418)—II 149
XIV 10:12 (§ 226)—I 380
XIV 10:17 (§ 235)—I 380
XIV 10:20 (§ 242)—I 380
XIV 10:23 (§ 258)—I 380
XIV 10:25 (§ 263)—I 380
XV 5:3 (§ 138)—III 371
XVI 2:3 (§ 28)—I 380
XVI 2:4 (§ 35)—I 381
XVIII 9:3 (§ 329)—I 14
XIX 5:3 (§ 290)—I 381
XIX 9:2 (§ 360)—I 310
XX 2:4 (§ 41)—II 77
XX 2:4 (* 5) (§ 47)—II 65
XX 3:2 (§ 64)—I 310

Contra Apionem—I 11
I 5 (§ 24)—I 12
I 5 (§ 26)—I 11
I 8 (§ 42)—II 138-139
I 9 (§ 50)—I 12
I 9 (§ 52)—I 12
I 10 (§ 53-55)—I 12
I 12 (§ 60)—I 293
I 29 (§ 269)—I 312
II 1 (§ 1-2)—I 344
II 1 (§ 1)—I 8
II 5 (§ 53 ff)—III 276
II 25 (§ 204)—I 275; 294
II 30 (§ 217)—II 107
II 39 (§ 282)—II 65

c. *DAMASCUS DOCUMENT*
11:12—II 265
12:6-7—II 320

d. *MANUAL OF DISCIPLINE*—
I 165-166

e. *PRAYER BOOK*
afternoon prayer—I 326
alenu-prayer—II 99-100
eighteen prayers—II 244; III 266
morning prayer (new moon)—I 233
musaphprayer—I 236

3. CHRISTIAN WRITINGS

Acta Joh. 94-97—III 144-147

Acta Pauli 10—I 243
Paul and Thecla
5—III 257
12—III 257
14—III 263
3 Corinthians
10-15—III 261
24-26—III 271

Acta Petri 38—III 5

Acta Thomae
13—II 296
25-27—III 140

Aphraates, *Dem.* 12:8—III 153

Apocalypsis Petri 17—III 278

Apocryphon Joh.—III 108-111; 210-211
openingsection—II 183-185; 192-193
p. 81-83 (Till)—III 273
p. 113 ff (Till)—III 207-208
p. 165 (Till)—III 209
p. 111 (Krause-Labib)—III 273
epilogue—II 183-185; 192-193

Aristides, *Apologia*
1:4—III 107-113
14:3—II 89
15:3—III 265

Athenagoras, *De Resurr.*
1—III 249
4—III 259
Suppl. 12:3—I 112

Athanasius, *De Inc. Verbi* 54:3—III 7

Barnabas
1:7—II 185
3—III 74
5:3—II 186
5:6-7—III 7; 8
12:2-3—III 242
19:2—II 131
21:9—III 381

Canones Apostolorum
14—II 131
30—II 131

1 Clemens
2:2—III 383
2:4—III 125-127; 131
5:7—I 393
7:4—II 11
11:2—III 338
12:7—II 11
20—III 52-58
21:1—III 53
21:8—II 31
22:6—I 244
28-34—III 335-336
28:3—I 394
32:3-4—III 342
33—III 356
34:4-8—III 327; 334-357
35—III 353-354
35:4—III 127; 353
37:5—III 126
38:1—III 127
45:8—I 244
46:3-4—III 131
47:6-7—II 318
50:3—II 98
53:2—III 72
55:6—III 71
56:1—III 342
57:2—III 127
58:2—III 127
59:2—III 126-127; 131
59:4—III 348
62:2—III 352
64—III 352

2 Clemens—III 196
3:4—II 307
13:1—II 307
13:2—II 310-312
13:3-4—II 308-309
13:4—I 112; 123
19:12—II 14

Ps.-Clemens, *Homilies*
II 6:1—II 187
II 10:1—II 187
III 11:1—II 187
IV 17—III 69-70

Clemens Alexandrinus
Protrept.
10—III 90
10:99—III 92

Paedag.—III 28
I 12, 98:2—I 279
III 12, 87:1—I 311
III 12, 97:3—I 311
III 62:2—III 305
Stromata
II 13, 55:6—III 75
III 5, 46:4—II 313
III 15, 98:4—I 279
V 23:1—I 162
VI 15:124—III 46
VI 15:125—III 46
VI 39:2-3—III 107
Exc. ex Theodoto 78:2—I 162

Constitutiones Apostolorum—III 9-10
1:10—II 312
2, 5:4—III 47
3, 5:6—II 312
6:24—III 35
7:35—III 330
8—III 330
8, 5:6—III 129
8, 22:3—III 129

Cyprianus, *Epist.* 13:3—II 311

Cyrillus Hieros., *Cat. Myst.*
1:2—III 140
1:3—III 153
3:4—III 139

Didache
4:13—II 131
10:5—III 93
10:7—III 385

Didascalia Apostolorum
3—II 312
6—III 47
20—III 261
21—III 128; 221
24—III 31
26—III 11-16; 18; 19-23; 31; 48; 49; 101

Epiphanius, *Panarion*
XXX 13:7 f—III 278-279
XXXI 7:5—III 264

Epistula Apostolorum
5—III 260
9-12—III 260
21 (32)—III 155
22-25—III 260
51 (62)—III 278

Eusebius
Dem. Ev. I 1:7—III 101
Praep. Ev.
I 3:13—III 101
IV 2:13—I 313
VII 2:2—II 300
IX 28—I 292
Hist. Eccl.
II 23:8-10—I 49
III 1:2—III 99
III 32:8—II 300
III 39:15—I 70-71
IV 23:12—II 130
IV 26:13-14—II 163
V 1:62—III 257
V 16:3—II 125; 127; 155; 162
V 17:2-3—II 127; 163
V 20:2—II 144
V 24—II 130
VI 13:3—III 40; 42
VI 14:7—I 39
VI 19:7—I 284-285
IX 10:1—I 279

Evangelium Petri 6:21—III 177

Evangelium Philippi
19—III 238
47—III 238
51—III 239-241
53—III 241-242

Evangelium Thomae log. 95—I 125

Evangelium Veritatis—III 179-183
p. 17—III 174
p. 19-20—III 175-176; 177-178
p. 31-32—III 170
p. 38—III 207
p. 42—III 178

Firmicus Maternicus, *De errore* 22—I 34

Gregorius Thaum., *Panegyric on Origen*
IV § 41—I 279
IV § 44—I 279
IV § 46—I 279
V § 48-50—I 280
V § 56—I 280
V § 58—I 280
V § 62—I 280
VII § 105-106—I 280

Heracleon
fr. 25—III 292
fr. 37—III 292-293

Hermas
Visiones
I 1:1—I 310
I 1:4—I 240; III 277
I 2:1—I 240; 244; III 277-278
I 3:2—I 244
III 9:1—I 309
III 10:6—III 73
Mandata
I 1-3—III 93
IV 2:2—III 71; 73
VIII 6—I 244
X 1—III 384
X 2:5—III 384
X 3—III 384
XI—II 187
XI 8—III 73
XI 9—III 383-384
XI 14-17—III 384
Similitudines
II 9—I 244
V 1:3—III 73
V 1:5—III 73
V 3:6—III 75
V 3:7—III 73; 74
V 3:8—I 244; III 74
VII 4—III 73
VIII 6:5—III 289
VIII 7:6—III 73
IX 9:5—III 312-313
IX 9:6—III 313
IX 13:6-9—III 313
IX 15:3—III 313
IX 22—III 289

Hieronymus, *De Viris Illustribus* 38—III 42

Hippolytus
De Antichristo
2—II 186
53-54—III 100
56—III 100
De Bened. Jac. 10—II 187
on *Gen. 49:7*—III 100
De Resurr.—III 263
Refutatio
V 7:20—II 185
V 7:29—II 185
Trad. Apost.
19:7 (p. 211 Riedel)—III 303
46 (p. 316 Horner)—III 303
115 (p. I 94 Achelis)—III 303
p. 7 (Dix)—III 362
p. 33 (Dix)—III 301
Ps.-Hippolytan Paschal Homily—III 153

Ignatius
Eph.
10:1—II 318
13:1—III 344
20:2—III 252
Magn. 8:1—III 25
Philad. 6:1—III 25
Rom. 2:1—II 307
Smyrn. 7:1—III 241
Trall.
3:2—II 318
8:2—II 312

Irenaeus
Adversus Haereses—III 27-28
I 4:5—II 303
I 6:1-2—III 291; 296
I 8:2—III 116
I 10:1—III 266
I 10:3—III 115
I 16:2—III 170
I 21—III 290-291
I 29—III 109
I 30:2—III 288
II 4:2—III 122
II 22:5—I 61
II 31:2—III 263
III 1:1-4—I 61
III 1:1—II 171
III 5:3—III 123
III 11:9—III 120; 188
III 11:15—III 122
III 15:2—III 264; 290
III 16:3, 5—III 252
III 17:1 ff—II 169
III 17:1—III 123
III 17:4—III 122
IV—II 168
IV pr. 4—III 117
IV 2:4—III 239
IV 7:1—III 118
IV 10:2—III 123
IV 20:4—III 122
IV 22:1—III 119
IV 24:1—III 119
IV 25:1—III 122
IV 33:1—II 186
IV 33:8—II 128
IV 33:14—II 168
IV 33:15—III 123
IV 34:3—III 122
IV 34:4—III 122
IV 35:5—III 117
IV 36:3—III 116
IV 36:7—III 118
IV 38:1—III 122; 123
IV 41:4—III 118
V 15:2—III 123
V 15:4—III 118
V 17:1—III 119
V 17:4—III 102
V 18:3—III 118
V 26:1—III 117
V 30:1—II 128
V 31:2—III 264-265
Epideixis
25—III 152-153
46—III 153
86 ff—II 168

2 Jeû 43—III 203

Johannes Chrysostomus, *Hom. in Pent.*
1:6—II 87

Ps.-Justinianus, *Cohortatio* II—III 69

Justinus Martyr
Apology
29:1—I 309
45:1—III 128; 221
49:5—I 43
61:10—I 313
Dial. cum Tryphone—III 25-26
17—II 311; 313
37:1—I 49
39:7—I 50
46:1—I 49
46:7—III 270
51:1—I 51
51:2—I 51
80—III 259
93—I 313
97:3—III 177
111:3-4—III 152
113—III 99-100
117—III 99
121—III 99-100

Ps.-Justinus, *De Resurr.*
2—III 261
10—III 257

Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 6:6—III 89

Liturgy of St. James—II 295-296

Liturgy of St. Mark—II 295-296

Martyrium Polycarpi 14—III 257

Melito of Sardes, *Homily on the Pascha*
49—III 152

50-56—III 154-155
67-69—III 150-152
80—III 145; 156
102—III 155

Minucius Felix, *Octavius*
6—III 91
11—III 259
34:11—III 257

Moses bar Kepha, *Exp. Jac. Lit.*—III 3-5

Nestorian Baptismal Liturgy—II 295

Odes of Solomon 34:4—III 3-6

Oracula Sibyllina
3:49-50—I 66
3:767 f—I 66

Origenes
Contra Celsum
1:47—I 309
1:55—III 101
4:57—III 217
5:14—III 259
5:25-41—III 91
5:61—III 259
7:32—III 258
8:75—III 91-92
De Princ. 3, 1:9—II 300
In Jer. 12:3—III 101
In Joh.
5:8—II 158
13, 38:248—I 34
28:12—III 101

Passio Perpetuae 20—III 306

Pionius, *Vita Polycarpi* 3—I 279

Pistis Sophia
I 4 (p. 4 Schmidt-Till)—III 278
23—III 218
26—III 218
27—III 218; 221
45—III 220
50—III 219
86—III 217
96—III 219-220
98—III 220
125—III 216-217
128—III 223

Polycarpus, *Philip.* 7:2—III 261
10:3-4—II 312

Protevangelium Jacobi 4:3—II 36

Ptolemaeus, *Ad Floram*—III 29-30
7:8-9—III 290

Sextus, *Sentences*
175—II 321-322
177—II 321-322
396—II 321-322

Sophia Jesu Christi—III 109-111

Tertullianus
Ad Scapulam 1—I 111
Adv. Hermogenem 22—II 129
Adv. Marcionem
3:23—II 311
4:14—II 311
Adv. Valentinianos
4—III 168; 171
16—II 303
Apologia 30:4—II 304
De cultu feminarum 2:7—III 305
De Idololatria 14—II 319
De Oratione 16—III 385
De praescr. haer.
30:2—III 173
38—II 129
38:7 ff—III 184
De Resurr.
1—III 256; 259
2—III 260; 262; 264
3—III 258
4—III 262
7:5—III 241
19—III 265
63—III 258

Ps.-Tertullianus, *Adv. omnes haer.*
4:6—III 167

Testamentum Domini
2:8—III 303
28—III 4-5

Theodorus Mops., *Homilies*
7:13—III 136
9:2—III 135
11:7—III 135
12:9—III 136
12:27—III 136
13:18—III 138
15:34—III 136
16:6—III 140
16:28—III 137
16:38—III 137

Theophilus, *Ad Autolycum*
1:13—III 259
1:14—II 186
2:9—II 186
2:33—II 186

Treatise on the Resurrection (Ad Rheg.)
III 267-269
p. 43—III 250; 251
p. 44—III 249; 250; 251; 252; 254
p. 45—III 247; 248; 252; 253
p. 46—III 248; 250; 252; 253
p. 47—III 247; 248; 249; 253
p. 48—III 248; 251; 253
p. 49—III 251; 253

Treatise on the Three Natures
fol. 94—III 293
fol. 97—III 293
fol. 122 f—III 293

4. PAGAN WRITINGS

Apollonius Rhodius
Argonautica II 418—I 395
Appianus
Historia Romana
VIII 37—I 317
VIII 79—I 317
Ps.-Apuleius
Asclepius
14—II 191-192
29—II 191-192
34—II 191-192
Aristoteles
Eth. Nic.
II 6:9-10 (1106B)—II 147
IX 7:2-3 (1167)—I 125
IX 7:2 (1167B)—I 121
X 9:11 (1180A)—I 312
Pol. VII 6 (1327A)—I 312
Ps.-Aristoteles
Rhet. ad Alex. 1446—I 118
Arrianus
Anabasis Alex.
I 18:6-9—I 80; 83; 85
I 20:1—I 80
II 3—I 81
V 1: 1-2—I 81
VII 28:2—I 81
Artemidorus
Oneirocr. II 70—II 145
Cassius Dio
Hist. Rom.
37:17—II 65
50, 25:3—I 382
67:14 (Epit.)—I 382
Catullus
21:2-4—II 189
24:2-4—II 189
49:1-3—II 190
Cicero
De Divinatione
I 43:97—III 279
I 44:99—III 279
II 28:60—III 279
De Natura Deorum III 9—III 90
De Officiis
I 48-49—I 121
III 6—III 89
De Oratore II 9:36—I 11
De Republica
III 41—I 382
V 1—I 382; II 194
Or. Post Red. ad Quir. 7—II 189
Corpus Hermeticum XIII 17—III 279
Crates
Epist. 31—I 395
Demosthenes
Or. 18:72-74 (249)—I 311
Or. 40:50 (1023)—I 284
Or. 53:19 (1252)—I 308
Epist. 4:7 (1488)—I 395
Dio Chrysostomus
Or. 1:67 ff—II 206
Or. 1:76—III 155
Or. 7:82-89—I 120
Or. 8:5—II 206
Or. 8:16-17—II 206
Diodorus Sic.
Bibl. Introd.—II 109
I 1:4—I 11
XI 46:1—II 108
XV 1:1—II 108
XXXIV (*XXIV)/XXXV 2—I 3
Ps.-Dionysius Halic.
Techne 6—I 278
Doctrine of Dwauf—II 143
Doctrine of Ptahhotep—II 143
Empedocles
fr. 21—II 191
Epictetus
Diss. I 9:1—III 88
II 14:18—I 118
II 22:26—I 277
III 1:35—I 278
III 22:68—I 309
Gellius
Noct. Att. 16:13—I 383

Heraclitus
fr. 30—II 191
Herodianus
Ab exc. divi Marci I 2:1—I 317
Herodotus
Hist. III 25—I 395
III 69—II 244
III 106—I 395
III 107—I 395
III 114—I 395
III 115—I 395
Hesiodus
Erga 352—I 118
Theogonia
32—II 190
38—II 190
Homerus
Ilias A 70—II 190
Horatius
Sat. I 4:177—I 382
Inscriptions (ed. Dittenberger)
t. II, tit. 736—III 306
t. III, tit. 999—III 306
Isocrates
Or. 8:41—I 316
Or. 12:264—II 147
Or. 16:28—I 275
Jamblichus
De Vita Pyth. 31 (213)—I 279
Livius
Ab Urbe Cond.
praef. 9—I 382
XXII 1—III 280
Lucianus
Abdic. 9 (2:167)—I 311
Anach. 20 (2:901)—I 311
Necyom. III-VI—III 64
Nigrin. 21—III 72
Pseudol. 18 (3:176)—I 311
Lucretius
De Rerum Natura I 460-461—II 190
Melissus
fr. 2—II 191
Menander
Monosticha 73 (Meineke = 114 Jäkel)—I 119
601 (Meineke = 114 v.l. Jäkel)—I 119
Menander (Rhetor)
περὶ ἐπιδεικτικῶν (ed. Spengel, III 419-420)—I 278
Nicolaus Damasc.
Vitae Caes. pr.—I 276
Orphic Hymn 25:4-5—II 190-191
Ovidius
Fasti III 370 ff—III 280
Metamorph. I 517-518—II 190
Pausanias
Perieg. X 12:5—II 191
Petronius
Cena Trimal. 57:5—II 301
Philostratus
Vita Apoll. IV 43—I 80
Plato
Apologia 18 A—I 312
Crito
50D-E—I 274-275
51C—I 275
54A—I 284
Phaedo 95E—II 146
Phaedrus 243B—II 300
Protagoras
325E-326D—III 64
327D—I 315
341C—I 312
Cratylus
384A—I 85
418A—II 146
431C-432A—II 146
Rep.
V 449D—I 308
VII 534D—I 315
IX 572C—I 308
IX 572D—I 312
Theaetetus 155A—II 146
Timaeus
23D—I 275
37E-38A—II 191
Menexenus
237A—I 274
238B—I 311
Leges
I 625A—I 312
I 643C—I 313
VI 783B—I 274
VIII 842E—I 274
IX 854E—I 315
X 887D—I 310
Alcibiades I 122B—I 274
Epinomis 973D—I 274
Ps.-Plato, *Axiochus* 366D—I 312

Plutarchus
Moralia:
De liberis
1-7 (1A-5C)—I 277
7 (5A)—I 284
Quomodo Adol.—III 65
14 (36E)—I 281; 311
Quomodo Adul.
25 (65F)—I 276
28 (68E-69E)—II 144

De Iside 9 (354C)—II 189
67 (377E-378A)—III 89
Conv. Disp. 8:7 (727B)—I 276
Suav. Viv. Epic. 27 (1104F)—II 244
Vita Paral.:
Lycurgus
6:4 (43D)—II 147
13:2 (47B)—II 148
16 (50A)—I 284
Numa 5 (63B)—I 276
Pericles 24 (165C)—I 310
Pyrrhus 9 (388A)—I 309
Eumenes 1 (583)—I 315
Phocion 38 (759B)—I 310
Tib. Gracchus 8 (827D)—I 309
C. Gracchus
8 (838C)—I 316
19 (843E)—I 316
41 (843F)—I 276
Cicero 48 (885D)—I 316
Pollux
Onom.
IX 113—I 4
IX 129—I 4
Polybius
Hist.
I 35:9—I 11
XXI 42:27—II 149
Porphyrius
Ad Marcel.
1—I 309
18—II 194; III 90
Quintilianus
Inst. Orat.
I 1-2:4—I 277
I 1:9—I 312
I 1:16—I 311
I 1:17—I 312
I 2:1—I 312
Seneca
De Benef.
I 2:4—II 88
I 6:1—II 88
II 31:3—I 121
III 17:4—I 281
De Vita Beata XIII 2—II 301
Nat. Quaest. VII 20:3—III 280
Silius Ital.
I 535 ff—III 280
Suetonius
Vitellius II 4:5—II 303
Tacitus
Hist. V 4-5—I 382
Ann. XIV 20—I 383
Thucydides
Hist.
II 40:4—I 119
V 18:23—II 148
V 18:47—II 148
V 23:6—II 148
Tibullus
Elegia I 3:27-32—III 306
Valerius Max.
Fact. et Dict. Mem. I 3:3—I 383
Varro
fr. 5—I 281
Vergilius
Aen.
I 263 f—I 382
IX 20—III 280
Georg. IV 392-393—II 190
Xenophon
Cyrop. VIII 2:22—I 119
Memor.
II 2:1-2—I 119
II 9:8—I 119
II 10:3—I 119
IV 4:24—I 119
IV 6:15—I 14
Symp. I 15—I 121
Xenophon Ephes.
Ephes. I 7:1—I 79-80

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

Abrahams, I.—III 308
Achelis, H.—III 11; 22; 23; 27; 29; 30; 31
Adam, K.—I 265
Allo, E. B.—I 146
Anrich, G.—III 302; 312
Appel, H.—II 34; 71; 76
Aytoun, R. A.—III 4
Bacher, W.—II 142
Baljon, J. M. S.—I 270; 329; 388; 391; II 13; 14; 23; 24; 79
Bamberger, B. J.—I 249; 252
Bardenhewer, O.—II 144; III 44; 46
Bardy, G.—III 287
Barr, J.—I 77; II 210; 305
Barrett, C. K.—I 39; 103; 106; 403; 404
Bauer, W.—I 44; 266; 287; 297; 314; 317; 330; III 71; 192
Bauernfeind, O.—I 248; 254; 283; 377; 389
Baumstark, A.—II 330-331
Beare, F. W.—I 377
Beer, G.—I 243
Behm, J.—I 176; III 323; 339
Bengel, J. A.—II 13; 27
Bengsch, A.—III 115
Bernard, J. H.—I 65
Beus, C. de—II 234
Beyer, H. W.—I 270; 390; III 44
Bigg, C.—II 13; 20
Billerbeck, P.—I 243; II 43; 44; 54; 221; 224
Black, M.—I 24; 115; II 261
Blank, T.—III 153-154
Blass, F.-Debrunner, A.—I 132; 135; II 76
Blau, L.—II 165
Bleeker, J. J.—III 62
Böhlig, H.—I 267; 303
Boer, W. den—III 44
Bolkestein, H.—I 118; 121-122; 126; 302; II 86-88; 90; 205
Boman, T.—II 210
Bonner, C.—I 231
Bonsirven, J.—I 178; II 66; 73; 74; 89; 222; III 56
Bornemann, W.—II 63; 76; 80
Bornhäuser, K.—I 62; 257
Bornkamm, G.—I 302
Botte, B.—III 332
Boulogne, R.—I 288
Bousset, W.—II 139; 239; III 330
Brandt, W.—III 310
Braun, F. M.—II 233
Brilioth, Y.—III 331; 334; 335
Brouwer, A. M.—I 40; 267; II 231
Bruce, F. F.—I 334; 390
Buchanan Gray, G.—I 218; 220
Büchler, A.—I 178; II 166; III 309; 313
Büchsel, F.—II 40; 236
Bultmann, R.—I 38; 41; 54; 64; 65; 67; 114; 147; 265; 271; 301; 357; II 225; 227; 256; III 203; 338
Burkitt, F. C.—III 10; 27; 29; 245
Burney, C. F.—I 133; II 224
Cadoux, C. J.—III 87
Calvin, J.—II 5; 37
Carlyle, T.—I 35
Carrington, P.—II 229
Chadwick, H.—II 321
Chevallier, M. A.—II 265
Colpe, C.—III 233
Connolly, R. H.—III 3; 9; 11; 14; 19; 22; 23; 27; 28; 29; 33; 299; 330
Conzelmann, H.—I 101; 103; 107; 357; 358; 387; 388; II 321
Craig, C. T.—II 258
Crehan, J. H.—I 390
Cross, F. L.—II 112
Cullmann, O.—I 39; 40; 56; II 232; 255
Dahl, N. A.—II 258
Dalman, G.—II 220
Dalmer, J.—II 10; 13; 15; 21; 24; 33
Daniélou, J.—II 145; 313; III 287
Davies, W. D.—I 302; III 205
Deissmann, A.—I 265-266; III 71
Dibelius, M.—I 7; 105; 350; 355-356; 367; II 80; 104; 229; 321; 325; III 313
Dibelius, M.-Kümmel, W. G.—I 266
Dibelius, O.—I 268
Dijk, J. van—II 208
Dijksterhuis, E. J.—III 170
Dix, G.—III 312; 332
Dobschütz, E. von—II 179-180
Dodd, C. H.—I 39; 40; 53; 55; 105; 257; 363; II 230-231; III 365
Dölger, F. J.—III 301; 302; 304
Drews, P.—III 329; 334; 351-352
Dugmore, C. W.—III 332
Dupont, J.—I 296; 342; 355
Easton, B. S.—I 343
Ebeling, G.—II 251
Eerdmans, B. D.—I 234; III 310

Eichrodt, W.—I 177
Feine, P.—I 268; II 33; 37; 71
Feine, P.-Behm, J.—I 39; 387
Fetter, J. C. A.—I 321-327
Fiebig, P.—I 234; II 221
Findlay, G. G.—I 303
Fischer, J.-A.—III 125
Flesseman-van Leer, E.—II 164
Foakes-Jackson, F. J.—I 352; 355; 389
Friedländer, M.—III 204
Friedrich, G.—II 262
Fritzsche, O. F.—I 226
Frör, K.—III 363
Fuchs, H.—III 86
Fustel de Coulanges, N. D.—III 87
Geffcken, J.—III 62; 63
Gemser, B.—II 135; 152
Geyl, P.—II 250
Giversen, S.—III 273
Glover, T. R.—I 146
Goethe, J. W. von—III 199
Goguel, M.—I 266
Goldschmidt, L.—II 42; 44
Goldziher, I.—II 299
Goppelt, L.—I 176; III 203
Grant, R. M.—III 204; 205; 208; 209
Gray, G. B.—III 55-56
Gregory, C. R.—III 59
Greydanus, S.—I 131; 304; II 12; 13; 14; 15; 17; 19; 22; 23; 24; 26; 28
Groningen, B. A. van—II 35
Grosheide, F. W.—I 145; 253; 266; 270; 287; 297; 300; 329; 330; 335; 376; 389
Grundmann, W.—I 134; 255; II 85; 104
Gunkel, H.—II 219
Haenchen, E.—I 103; 296; 377; 388; 409
Harder, G.—III 383
Harnack, A. von—I 36; 96; 243; 348; 365; II 63; 126; 159; 160; 164; 227; 319; 324; III 30; 35; 37; 38; 46; 53; 57; 60; 67; 68; 192; 194; 215; 251; 357
Hauck, F.—II 14; 16; 23; 28; III 352
„Heidelberg Catechism"—II 5
Heinemann, I.—II 151
Heinrici, G.—II 180
Heitmüller, W.—I 39; 40
Hennecke, E.—III 5; 23; 27; 29
Héring, J.—II 255
Hesseling, D. C.—I 277
Hoennicke, G.—I 329; 389
Hoh, J.—II 164
Holl, K.—III 88
Holtzmann, H. J.—I 331; 388; II 97; 235
Holzmeister, U.—II 9; 12; 14; 15; 16; 20; 23
Horst, F.—I 224
Hort, F. J. A.—III 100
Hoskyns, E.—I 67
Howard, W. F.—I 38; 265; 271; II 224
Huizinga, J.—III 77
Hunter, A. M.—I 342; 353; II 236-238
Jacquier, E.—I 267; 389
Jaeger, H.—II 272
James, M. R.—II 36
Jentsch, W.—I 283; 309
Jeremias, A.—II 302
Jeremias, J.—I 288; II 221; III 318-325
Jonas, H.—III 203; 232
Jülicher, A.—I 39; II 228
Jülicher, A.-Fascher, E.—I 257; II 81
Jüthner, J.—III 88
Jung, C. G.—III 236
Jungmann, J. A.—III 231; 362; 363
Käsemann, E.—I 8; 100; 102; 107; 357-358; 359; 372; II 222
Kattenbusch, F.—III 45
Kelly, J. N. D.—II 159; 164
Kennedy, H. A.—I 175
Keulers, J.—I 216; 248; 268; 329; 389
Kittel, G.—II 221; 298
Klausner, J.—I 189; 304; 355; III 79-80
Klijn, A. F. J.—III 140; 261
Knopf, R.—I 301; 332; II 10; 13; 15; 16; 20; 21; 24; 26; 27; 28; 29; 51; 95; 132; 309; 312; 318; III 53; 54; 56; 57; 98; 102; 124; 132; 329; 330; 337; 339; 341; 343; 348
Köhler (*Kohler), L.—II 61
Köster, H.—I 113; 402
Koetschau, P.—II 300
Koole, J. L.—III 36
Kretschmar, G.—III 187; 204
Kühl, E.—II 13; 15; 17; 18; 19; 21; 22-23; 24; 27; 32; 33; 40
Kümmel, W. G.—I 387
Kuhn, K. G.—II 299
Kuiper, K.—I 4
Kunst, P. G.—I 270
Lagarde, P. de (Bötticher)—III 8
Lake, K.-Cadbury, H. J.—I 254; 273; 287; 297; 329; 389
Lebreton, J.—III 326
Liebermann, S.—II 153
Lietzmann, H.—I 140; 145; 196; 197; 200; II 11; 223; III 326; 331; 334; 343; 353
Lightfoot, J. B.—I 61; II 312; 313; III 328-329; 337; 339; 360
Linton, O.—II 233
Lipsius, R. A.—III 188
Lock, W.—III 263
Lodder, W.—I 74; III 357

Lohmeyer, E.—II 134
Lohse, B.—III 157
Lohse, E.—I 107
Loisy, A.—I 268; 357
Lorentz, R.—III 299
Lowther Clarke, W. K.—III 124; 127
Lukyn Williams, A.—I 50
Luther, M.—I 129; II 4-5; 111
Machen, J. G.—I 268
Manson, T. W.—II 227-228; 269-271
Manson, W.—I 74; II 255
Marrou, H. I.—I 313
Mason, A. J.—II 17; 22
Matthes, J. C.—III 316
Maxwell, W. D.—III 326
McGiffert, A. C.—I 342
Mehl, H.—I 163
Melanchton, P.—I 143
Menoud, P.—I 343
Michaelis, W.—I 39; II 75
Michel, O.—I 215-216; 229-230; III 365
Mingana, A.—III 3; 141
Mönnich, C. W.—III 59; 62
Moffatt, J.—I 362; II 69; 75; 80; 113; 184; 287
Montefiore, C. G.—I 302
Moore, C. H.—III 79; 87-88; 91
Moore, G. F.—I 252; II 42; 45; 52; 60; 72; 74; 78; 221
Mulder, H.—I 14-15; 372
Murray, G.—III 66
Nautin, P.—III 158
Nes, H. M. van—II 13; 24; 26
Nestle, E.—I 329
Niemeier, G.—III 95
Nock, A. D.—I 270
Norden, E.—I 268-269; 344
Obbink, H. W.—I 72; 89
Odeberg, H.—II 224
Oesterley, W. O. E.—III 331
Ollson, B.—II 133
Oort, H.—II 220
Overbeck, F.—I 388
Palache, J. L.—I 239
Payne Smith, R.—II 301
Pedersen, J.—I 229; III 320
Percy, E.—II 222
Perdelwitz, R.—II 55; 63; 67
Peterson, E.—II 272; 291; 292
Plooy, D.—II 327
Plummer, A.—I 12; 196; 200; III 344
Preisker, H.—II 108
Preuschen, E.—I 297; 335; 389; III 38
Pricaeus, J.—II 145
Probst, F.—III 327-328; 329; 353; 356
Puech, H. C.—III 109; 193
Puech, H. C.-Quispel, G.—III 190; 194; 195
Puukko, A. F.—I 266
Quispel, G.—I 36; III 164; 166; 193; 204; 207; 209; 226
Rackham, R. B.—I 267; 335; 377
Radhakrishnan, S.—III 237; 271
Rahmani, I. E.—III 332
Rawlinson, A. E. J.—I 265
Rech, H.—I 382
Reicke, B.—II 86; III 205
Reitzenstein, R.—I 196; III 232; 233
Rendel Harris, J.—I 51; III 3; 28
Rengstorf, K. H.—I 210; III 56
Rigaux, B.—I 300
Ritschl, A.—II 10; 13; 27; 40
Roberts, R.—II 251
Robinson, J. M.—II 251
Rogers, C. F.—III 308
Rohde, J.—I 387; 400
Ros, J.—I 132
Rudberg, G.—I 3
Russell Scott, D.—II 273; 274
Ryle, H. E.-James, M. R.—I 399
Ryssel, V.—I 225
Sabatier, A.—I 267; 322
Sagnard, F.—III 293
Salmasius, C.—I 132
Sanders, L.—III 53
Sandmel, S.—II 208
Scheller, P.—II 108
Schlatter, A.—I 76; 78; 86; 196; II 220; 224; 310
Schlier, H.—I 146; 362; II 272; 273; 292; III 287
Schmidt, C.—III 30; 109
Schmidt, K. L.—I 43
Schmithals, W.—I 196
Schmitz, O.—I 226-227; II 24-25
Schniewind, J.—III 322; 323
Scholem, G.—III 221; 234
Schoot, E. van der—III 334
Schredelseker, P.—III 306
Schrenk, G.—II 60
Schubert, P.—I 92; 343
Schürer, E.—I 383; II 78; 221
Schulz, S.—I 104
Schulze, S.—I 197
Schwartz, E.—III 330
Schweitzer, A.—II 231
Scott, E. F.—I 42; II 236-237
Seeberg, A.—II 229
Seeberg, R.—II 170
Seeligmann, J. L.—II 311
Sellin, E.—II 239
Selms, A. van—I 221

Selwyn, E. G.—I 123; II 84; 85; 92; 93; 95; 228-229
Sevenster, G.—I 111; II 213; 255
Simon, M.—III 204
Sjöberg, E.—I 232
Smitskamp, H.—III 77
Smolders, D.—II 273; 282
Snaith, N. H.—I 234
Söderblom, N.—I 272
Srawley, J. H.—III 332
Stählin, G.—I 388; II 315
Stauffer, E.—I 70; II 235-236
Steinmann, A.—I 264; 269; 271; 273; 274; 296; 298; 300; 329; 377
Stempvoort, P. A.—I 184
Stone, D.—III 318
Strachan, R. H.—I 145
Strack, H. L.—III 156
Streeter, B. H.—II 112; 227
Stumpff, A.—II 65
Täubler, E.—II 149
Taylor, V.—I 22; II 227; 255
Terlaak Poot, L. D.—III 323
Thackeray, H. St. J.—II 310
Thomas, J.—III 30
Torm, F.—I 282
Torrey, C. C.—I 132; 257; II 224
Toynbee, A. J.—I 6
Traub, H.—III 276
Trench, R. C.—I 284
Turner, H. E. W.—III 192
Valeton, Jr., J. J. P.—II 252
Volz, P.—II 98; III 131
Vrede, W.—II 14; 15
Vriezen, T. C.—I 177; II 166; 239
Wagenvoort, H.—III 95
Walz, H. H.—III 96
Weber, H. R.—III 96
Weidinger, K.—II 106
Weinreich, O.—II 191
Weiss, B.—II 235
Weiss, J.—I 75; 301; III 323
Wendland, H. D.—I 196; 197
Wendland, P.—I 132; II 137
Wendt, H. H.—I 214; 247; 254; 272
Wenschkewitz, H.—I 226; II 25
Wensinck, A. J.—I 135; 147; III 319; 320
Werner, E.—II 211
Werner, M.—II 231-232; III 114; 115; 121; 148
Wettstein, J. J.—I 78-79; II 196-199
Wheeler Robinson, H.—II 228
Wikenhauser, A.—I 353
Wilckens, U.—I 105; 107
Wilde, W. J. de—I 217; 219
"Wilhelmus"—III 96
Williams, C. S. C.—I 389; III 104
Wilson, R. McL.—III 204; 239
Wilson, T.—I 263
Windisch, H.—I 145; 196; 198; 200-201; II 9 ff; 54; 56; 60; 61; 67; 69; 93; 99; 137
Windisch, H.-Preisker, H.—II 112
Winer, G. B.—II 13
Wohlenberg, G.—II 10; 12; 14; 16; 19; 21; 22; 23; 24; 26
Wrede, W.—I 39; II 239
Zahn, T.—I 32; 253; 254; 282; 298; 300; 332; 334; II 61; 72; 75; 125-126; 133; 159-160; 164; III 42; 45; 263
Zandee, J.—III 293
Zwaan, J. de—I 254; 257; II 224; III 97; 164

INDEX OF SUBJECTS

a. Greek words.

ἀγαθοποιεῖν/εὐποιεῖν—I 116-126; II 84-86; 103; 106; 110
αἷμα (Χριστοῦ)—II 3-82
ἄμωμος, ἄσπιλος, φθαρτός—II 33-40
ἀναστροφή—II 32-33
βασιλεία τοῦ θεοῦ (in Acts)—I 359
βοάω—III 346-347
βοηθός—III 347
δεκτός—I 255; II 37-38
δευτέρωσις (second legislation)—III 7-39; 48
διασπείρω—II 243-247; III 101
ἔθη/mores—I 379-385; II 194-195
ἔπαινος—II 107-108
ἐπισκοπή—II 98-99
ἰδού—I 330-331
κλέος—II 106-107
λυτρόω—II 40-41
μάρτυς and cogn.—I 52; 367-370
μνημόσυνον—I 214-233
μυστήριον—I 190-191
ναί—I 150-151
ὁλόκληρος—I 136-137
οὖν—I 200; III 337
παρρησία—I 200-210; 349; 369; II 271-289
παιδεία/παιδεύω—I 275-318; III 63-67
ῥῆμα—I 73; 86-88
συμβαλλεῖν—I 72-91
συντηρέω—I 88-90
σωτηρία—I 363-367; 372
τίμιος—II 46-48
(ἀνα)τρέφω and cogn.—I 266-318
ὑψωθῆναι—I 64-65
φοβούμενος τὸν θεόν—I 248-251
χάρις—I 119-120; 122-126

b. Subjects.

canon—III 184-185
Christ, Son of Man, Son of David—I 40-63; 64-65; 68; III 251-252
(new) covenant—I 199; 200; 207; II 325-326; 332
eschatology—I 359; II 224-225; 230-232
"Formgeschichte"—II 227
gnosticism—I 403-406; 409
Hellenization of Christianity—II 209-213
history of salvation—I 103; 108; 357
incarnation—III 7
Jewish orthodoxy—III 205
"Parousieverzögerung"—I 103; 357; III 121
Paul and Hellenism—I 305-306
proselytism—II 53-68
qedusha—III 331; 332; 335
signs (and wonders)—I 53-54; 370-371
Stoicism—II 118; III 53-54; 56; 186
unity and variety in the N.T.—II 234-239
Valentinians—III 167-169; 264-265